ECCLESIA SPIRITUS: THE CENTRALITY OF THE SPIRIT'S OPERATION IN TERTULLIAN'S THEOLOGY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF

GORDON-CONWELL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SOUTH HAMILTON MASSACHUSSETTS

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF ARTS (CHURCH HISTORY)

BY
CAMERON I. BROCK

JULY 20, 2020

ECCLESIA SPIRITUS: THE CENTRALITY OF THE SPIRIT'S OPERATION IN TERTULLIAN'S THEOLOGY

Abstract

The following work focuses on the centrality of the Holy Spirit in Tertullian's theology, which found its primary expression in the Holy Spirit's operation within the Church.

This thesis's evidence rests on Tertullian's close association of the Holy Spirit with the divine substance, which enabled him to affirm the Three's equality and unity while appropriating unique operations to the Spirit. Within Tertullian's summation of substance and Spirit rests this paradox: The Third Person, who proceeds from both the Father and the Son, is nevertheless the *substantia spiritus*, which constitutes the unity of the Three. Therefore, any operations appropriated to the Spirit necessitates a grounding in the Trinity's Unity of Operations and the Doctrine of Simplicity.

The thesis begins with a historical evaluation of the socio-historical dimensions of Tertullian's context, highlighting significant themes that influenced the ecclesial community of North Africa. A secondary issue addressed is Tertullian's complicated relationship with the New Prophecy and the shared language of pneumatic indwelling. It then argues that *substantia* functioned as an ontological designation of unity and plurality in *Adversus Praxean*. Furthermore, the association of *spiritus* with the *substantia Dei* grounded the Spirit's indwelling within the Church as the Person who consecrates, reveals, and disciplines the ecclesial community.

In particular, the following paper corrects a common misrepresentation of Tertullian's Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, that he subordinated the Holy Spirit as a vicarious power of the Son. Instead, it contends that Tertullian intentionally asserted the centrality of the Holy Spirit in his theology and that the procession of the Holy Spirit is sequence and not subordination.

VITA

The author of this work is Cameron I. Brock. Born July 22, 1994, in New Orleans, Louisiana, he received his formal education via Maranatha Christian School. Upon graduation, he enrolled at Bryan College in Dayton, Tennessee, where he received his bachelor of arts in History, with minors in Greek and Philosophy. In 2016, he entered Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, receiving a Masters of Arts in Theological Studies in 2019. He expects to complete the Masters of Arts in Church History following the Summer of 2020.

Mr. Brock currently resides in Gloucester, MA. and will be teaching Latin and Greek courses in the Fall of 2020.

CONTENTS

PREFACE i

ABBREVIATIONS iii

INTRODUCTION 1

I. Methodology 2

II. Arrangement 3

CHAPTER 1 HISTORICAL EVALUATIONS 6

I. The Rise of North African Christianity 7

II. Tertullian: A Brief Biographical Sketch 13

III. The New Prophecy: A Historical Mosaic 16

CHAPTER 2 DIVINE SUBSTANCE AND SPIRIT 28

I. Substantia in Antiquity: Peripatetic and Stoic Applications 30

II. Substantia in Tertullian 38

III. Spiritus: Substantia et Persona 49

CHAPTER 3 DIVINE INDWELLING AND OPERATION 57

I. Divine Indwelling: Sacred Space and Divine Benefaction 58

II. Trinitarian Communication and Progressive Revelation 64

III. Community Discipline: The Expectation of Consecration and Revelation 69

CONCLUSION 72

BIBLIOGRAPHY 76

PREFACE

> "Truth does not wonder at her preset condition. She knows that she plays the role of an alien on earth, that among strangers she readily discovers enemies, but that she has her origin, abode, hope, recompense, and honor in heaven."[1]

I discovered Tertullian relatively late in my academic studies. It was three years ago while taking a class at Boston College that I first read Tertullian's, *Adversus Praxean*. I was impressed by his ability to wield rhetoric as a tool against various notions. It was fortunate that in two other classes, Tertullian was a central figure, and I was able to read more substantial portions of his vast corpus. As with any writer, Tertullian challenged many of my theological assumptions. While I do not agree with everything he has written or espoused, I recognize that I am deeply indebted to him. Thus, I decided to write my thesis centering both on the Trinity and the Holy Spirit.

The thesis itself would be impossible to draft if it were not for the instructive criticism and encouragement from my readers—Gwenfair Adams and Donald Fairbairn. Adams, in particular, has been a supportive critic of my writing style and approach. It was Adams's keen eye and theological instinct, which proved invaluable in the final drafts of this text. My approach to Patristics stems from Fairbairn's erudition over a vast number of topics in the field. His historical approach to theology has taught me the importance of navigating the past via a lens of empathy and grace. His mentorship and willingness to sit and dialogue with me shaped my understanding of what it means to be a scholar and a teacher. Truthfully, if it were not for both Adams and Fairbairn, I would not have finished this project.

[1] Tertullian, "Apology," in *Christian and Pagan in The Roman Empire: The Witness of Tertullian*, ed. by Robert Sider (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University Press, 2001), 9.

I must also extend my appreciation to Adonis Vidu. From my time at seminary, my only regret is that I could not take more of his classes. It was during his Systematic Theology class that I first became interested in the Trinity and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. As a professor, he was always willing to answer questions and assist his students in navigating difficult topics. Much of the second chapter is deeply indebted to our conversations both in and outside of class.

Language is the vehicle of ideas. Therefore, I could not have hoped to read Tertullian in his original Latin language in it was not for my first Latin instructor, Fr. James Conn. His teaching and guidance laid the linguistic foundation that made reading Tertullian possible. I am also thankful for my various Greek instructors over the years. Jud Davis, Margaret Schatkins, and Judy Haley provided their unique passions and gifts to develop in their students the linguistic skills necessary to succeed in translating original texts.

The following thesis is dedicated to the two individuals who impacted my life the most, my mother and father. My mother homeschooled me, and as such, she was my first teacher. She taught me to read, write and allowed me the freedom to express my passion for history. My father exemplified the virtues of diligence and courage. As a child, it was his love of Civil War History, which first drove me to study the past. All that I am and all that I will be can be traced back to their love and daily sacrifices.

My last remarks of gratitude I extend to my wife, Sarah. She has been my rock and inspiration throughout this project. Her listening ear and attentive encouragement kept me going through some of the most challenging sections. I am thankful that God gave to me such a gift as her.

July 17, 2020

ABBREVIATIONS

ACW	*Ancient Christian Writers*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
CCSL	*Corpus Christianorum*, Series Latina (Turnhout, 1953-)
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*
JEH	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LCL	*Loeb Classic Library*
NT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTG	*Novum Testamentum Graece*
PMS	*Patristic Monograph Series*
PPS	*Popular Patristic Series*
SVF	*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*

INTRODUCTION

There are few within the study of Patristic Theology who have received more scholarly attention than Tertullian. His influence over Western theology is indisputable, for it was his reflection on the Trinity, which established the classical Trinitarian dictum, *una substantia*, *tres personae*. As the first theologian of North Africa, understanding his doctrines and rhetoric remain paramount to the study of North African Christianity. His relationship with the New Prophecy has remained a point of contention among scholars, who often characterize it as either profane or fanatical.[2] And yet, given all of the scholarly attention, there is much in Tertullian's thought manipulated or misrepresented.

One of the most misinterpreted doctrines of Tertullian is his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This is in part due to the notable absence of Christ's sacrifice in Tertullian's more Ecclesial works (i.e., *De Baptismo*, *On Oratione*, *De Paenitentia*, *De Pudicitia*), which has produced several corrective assessments by scholars, wishing to maintain the centrality of the Son in Tertullian's theology. In such works, the subordinationist tendencies of Tertullian are made more prominent; the Spirit relegated to a "vicarious power (*vicaria vis*) of the Son."[3] A secondary consequence of such emendation is that it places the processions and operations of the Second and Third Persons as contrasted powers within the Church's life, rather than viewing them as a complementary sequence of processions.

The purpose of the present study is to contend that Tertullian intentionally asserted the centrality of the Holy Spirit in his theology, not at all within a subordinate scheme. Instead, it was the Spirit's close association with the divine substance that enabled him to affirm the

---

[2] Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in The Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in The Age of The Fathers* (London: Macmillan and Company, 1912), 70.
[3] J. Van Oort, "The Holy Spirit and the Early Church: Doctrine ad Confession," *HS* 67 (2011): 2, accessed December 30, 2019, doi: http:// dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts. v67i3.1120.

Three's equality and unity, while appropriating operations uniquely to the Spirit. Within Tertullian's summation of substance and spirit rests this paradox: The Third Person, which proceeds from both the Father and the Son, is nevertheless the *substantia spiritus*, which constitutes the unity of the Three. Any operations appropriated to the Spirit necessitates a grounding in the Trinity's Unity of Operations.

Since Tertullian presented Holy Spirit's operations primarily within the context of divine indwelling, special attention is given to Tertullian's Ecclesiology. Following the reception of the Spirit during the rite of baptism, the Spirit's operations manifest in the life of the Church as the 'gifts' of the Spirit. These gifts include sanctification, revelation, and discipline. While some scholars may bemoan Tertullian's more charismatic Ecclesiology,[4] it was his Pneuma-centric approach that enabled him to construct a cohesive system of thought.

I. Methodology

A two-fold method of analysis will be incorporated into this study. The first method is historical. All theology is contextual, and Tertullian was no exception to that rule. His audience in North Africa undoubtedly shaped the various perspectives of his writings. Further, the pneumatic emphasis of Ecclesiology requires socio-historical deliberation. Ecclesiology, by its very nature, assumes the dynamics of a community. As such, it is vital to historically evaluate the various pagan communities within North Africa that informed the socio-religious landscape of the Second and Third Centuries. And since we are restricted in our observations of Tertullian's context, whatever we may surmise from his writings requires a keen literary eye.

Therefore, our second approach to this study will be a literary analysis of Tertullian's various texts. This method comes with several significant challenges. The vast corpus of

[4] Robert Evans, *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought* (London: S.P.C.K., 1972), 29.

Tertullian extends several decades, requiring a preliminary assessment to evaluate his consistency of thought. A second issue stems from Tertullian's relationship with the New Prophecy. Because scholarship has been so keenly aware of these challenges, there already exists a copious amount of literary assessment which will make the literary evaluations succinct.

Any literary analysis is grossly inadequate unless it considers the original languages through which the texts were composed. Translations are essential, but nothing can replace the untranslated text. And since our study especially highlights the usage and application of specific words, the majority of primary quotations remain in their untranslated form.

II. Arrangement

The following study has been arranged into three main chapters. Chapter 1 broadly evaluates the socio-historical dimensions of Tertullian's context. This is essential as it establishes the historical relevance of Tertullian in the context of North Africa. Section I (pg. 8) briefly summarizes the rise of North African Christianity, highlighting themes of persecution and martyrdom which formed the identity of the Christian community in and around Carthage. Section II (pg. 14) provides a detailed, albeit brief, biographical sketch of Tertullian, establishing his place within North African Christianity as its first theologian. Finally, Section III (pg. 17) analyzes the complicated history of the New Prophecy, specifically noting Tertullian's relationship with the movement and how it accentuated certain notions concerning divine indwelling. This last point is significant since the manifestation of two of the Holy Spirit's operations, revelation and discipline, are prevalent in some of Tertullian's Montanist texts.

Chapter 2 focuses on Tertullian's association of the *substantia Dei* with the Holy Spirit, which culminates in the assertion that the Holy Spirit's operation, in its relation to the divine substance, is not unlike the Spirit's role in the Church. The primary text evaluated here is

Adversus Praxean, which constituted the majority of Tertullian's Trinitarian formula. Section I (pg. 31) traces the historical lineage of the philosophical applications of *substantia* in two primary schools of thought, Peripatetic and Stoic. These two schools' approaches remain antithetical to one another, enabling a historically organic structure for the discussion of *substantia* in Antiquity. A second reason to highlight these two systems is their influence on Tertullian's application of the term *substantia*, with clear leanings towards Stoic corporality. Section II (pg. 39) categorizes and establishes three primary usage of *substantia* in Tertullian, focusing on its ontological designation, which established a boundary of thought in Tertullian's Trinitarian discourse. Section III (pg. 50) continues the discussion of the previous section, revealing that Tertullian's application of *substantia* informs his Pneumatology and his understanding of divine indwelling. This is especially relevant since it would follow that if the divine substance constitutes the fullness of divinity, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit would constitute a Trinitarian indwelling.

The final chapter addresses the three primary operations of the Spirit in the life of the Church: sanctification, revelation, and discipline. The primary texts assessed in this chapter are *De Paenitentia*, *De Oratione*, *De Baptismo*, *De Pudicitia*, *De Idolatria*, and *De Fuga*. Section I (pg. 59) shows how the reception of the Spirit in baptism constituted a blending of two paradigms in Antiquity—the religious paradigm of sacred landscapes and the socio-cultural paradigm of patronage. The indwelling of the Spirit consecrated the individual and the community, in which the Spirit bestowed *beneficium*. The first of these benefits was the operation of sanctification, which in turn, enabled two distinct yet closely related operations. Section II (pg. 65) shows how Tertullian's Trinitarian designation of the Spirit as Trinitarian communicator, developed his view of progressive revelation. The assessment in Chapter 1,

Section III, which argues for a shared language of experience between Tertullian and the New Prophecy, heightened the 'ecstatic' manner of prophecy in the revelatory operation of the Holy Spirit. Also, it is argued that since it is the unique operation of the Spirit to communicate the Trinity, the *vicarious power* of Christ communicated to the Church does not constitute a subordination of the Spirit. Instead, it constitutes an extension of Christ's power; however, extended via the procession of the Holy Spirit. Finally, Section III (pg. 70) focuses on the Spirit's operation of instruction and discipline, an idea closely related to the previous two operations discussed. Here it is clear that because the Church exists as consecrated space, the life and well-being of the Church depends on her ability to maintain the integrity of that sacred space.

While this study is by no means exhaustive, these three chapters establish that the Holy Spirit's indwelling and operation were not subordinate to the power of Christ. Instead, the Spirit formed an integral operation within the Church's life as the sequential Third Person. The close association of substance and Spirit allowed a truly Trinitarian formulation that nevertheless recognized the distinct procession of the Holy Spirit, and therefore, its distinct operations within the Church's life. In such a manner, Tertullian espoused that the Holy Spirit is 'power' of the Christian and the 'soul' of the Church.

CHAPTER 1: HISTORICAL EVALUATIONS

It is tempting to detach Tertullian's Ecclesiology and Pneumatology from his context in North African Christianity. His Ecclesiology, which contains both universal and apostolic formulations, is common among Christian writers of the second century. North African Christianity is also a wasteland of historical uncertainties making any summarization of details nearly impossible. No one knows how or when Christianity arose on the Berber Coast of North Africa. It is then easier to address Tertullian's Ecclesiology systematically, without considering its North African context. Though this may be an attractive method of study, it is ill-advised for several reasons.

First, Tertullian has been regarded as a "controversialist"[5]; however, Tertullian wrote very little that was controversial. He was a controversialist in that he was inspired to write amidst periods of conflict. Some of those conflicts extended beyond the regions of North Africa, but it was the local life and experiences that informed his writings' attitude and message. Tertullian then was not just a theologian, but he was a North African theologian. A Carthaginian by birth and a Roman citizen. All of these shaped how he interpreted various theological positions. Second, even with the ambiguity surrounding the rise of North African Christianity, it is possible to surmise various practices and themes that shaped the community in the late second century. These practices informed Tertullian's experiences and shaped his reflections on how the community was to operate within North Africa.

Therefore, to understand Tertullian's Ecclesiology and Pneumatology, the following chapter is devised of three primary sections: Section I (pg. 2) briefly summarizes the rise of North African Christianity, highlighting themes and ideas which formed the identity of the

[5] John Morgan-Wynne, *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD. 90-200* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2006), 226.

Christian community in and around Carthage. Section II (pg. 8) focuses on the man Tertullian, detailing his place within North African Christianity as its first theologian. Finally, Section III (pg. 11) analyzes the complicated history of the New Prophecy, specifically noting Tertullian's relationship with the movement and how it accentuated certain notions concerning divine indwelling.

I: The Rise of North African Christianity

The origins of North African Christianity remain a mystery. There are several theories as to how and when Christianity was introduced to the Punic population. One theory suggests that Greek merchants were the first to introduce Christianity to the region.[6] There is merit to this theory since the province of North Africa provided essential resources to the rest of the Roman Empire, which was primarily supplied via Carthage's harbor.[7] Consequentially, commerce provided a simple vehicle for the spread of religious ideas and philosophy. Another theory recognizes the existence of a Jewish diaspora in and around Carthage, which suggests the plausibility that a Jewish-Christian community introduced Christianity.[8] Following the Jewish revolt near the end of the First Century, many Jews were scattered throughout the empire. Jewish Christians likely arrived in Carthage roughly around that time or shortly thereafter.[9] Moreover, another speculative theory highlights the catalog of regions represented by the multitude at Pentecost, in which people from, "Egypt and the parts of Libya near Cyrene,"[10] were said to be present.[11] This would indicate then that the spread of Christianity to North Africa occurred

---

[6] Charles Freeman, "New Beginnings: The Emergence of A Latin Christianity," in *A New History of Early Christianity*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 196.
[7] François Decret, *Early Christianity in North Africa* (Havertown: James Clarke Company, 2011), 1.
[8] W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in The Early Church* (New York: Anchor Books, 1965), 361. Cf. François Decret, *Early Christianity in North Africa*, 13-15.
[9] Barnes notably rejects this theory outright for several reasons. Vid. Timothy Barnes, *A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 273-76.
[10] *Acts* 2:10.
[11] Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 64.

during the Apostolic period, though not through an Apostle.[12] None of these theories are mutually exclusive. It is possible that the spread of Christianity was a combination of any number of these theories. Furthermore, we may desire to fill the historical gaps with certainty, the lack of historical and epigraphical evidence makes such an endeavor futile. Regardless of its origins, it is clear that Christianity spread quite quickly long the Berber Coast.

The local linguistic, cultural, and religious background contributed to Christianity's popularity within the region. The city of Carthage had an extensive past, first as a Phoenician colony, which eventually developed into the vast Punic Empire.[13] It is clear that following its conquest by Rome in 146 B.C.E., the city continued to prosper. By the end of the Second Century, the Historian Herodian described the city as "next after Rome in wealth, population, and size," although closely comparable to another African metropolis, Alexandria.[14] Therefore, because two different powers in Antiquity controlled Carthage, the cultural milieu consisted of both Punic and Roman elements. Historians of Modernity tended to focus on the Romanization of North Africa as a Province rather than seeking to understand its Punic heritage.[15]

---

[12] Tertullian's argument in *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* very clearly binds the Apostolic unity of the Church indirectly to the Carthaginian community. The argument follows that, while Carthage could not claim direct lineage to an Apostle, it's relationship with Apostolic churches meant that it was in communion and unity with those churches, thereby being 'apostolic.' Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* XXXVI (CCSL I, 216-7).

[13] If there were once histories or writings from Punic sources, they are no longer extant. Any sources of Carthaginian majesty stems from European sources, who repeatedly laud the Imperial might of Carthage. For example, both Cicero and Aristotle praised Carthage for its wisdom and political leadership. Cf. Cicero, "De Re Publica," in *Cicero XVI: De Re Publica, De Legibus*, trans. by Clinton Keyes, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), 108-09. Aristotle, "Politics," in *Aristotle XXI: Politics*, trans. by H. Rackham, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944), 156-7.

[14] Herodian, *History of The Empire II*, trans. by C. R. Whitaker, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 190-1.

[15] German idealism and British Empiricism, prevalent in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, has been aptly regarded by Thomas Oden as a source for this sentiment. He, as well as many others, argues for an evaluation of North African Christianity that acknowledges the African elements in the writings of Latin Christianity's greatest theologians. Thomas Oden, *How Africa Shaped The Christian Mind* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 70.

The first reference to Christians in North Africa appears in the slanderous caricature of Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*,[16] not uncommon among pagan sources.[17] In this text, a miller's wife is portrayed as abandoning the gods and following a new religion that sought to worship a God whom she referred to as, "One and Only."[18] This sacrilege led to her involvement in secret, sexual meetings, and a fanatical desire for death.[19] Considering this grotesque portrayal, it is little wonder that Christians in North Africa experienced intermittent periods of persecution at local authorities' hands. Consequently, the earliest Christian texts from the region are martyrdom accounts.

The first of these accounts is *The Passion of The Scillitan Martyrs*, a trial transcript detailing the events that led to the deaths of twelve Christians in 180 C.E.[20] The second, a lengthier martyrdom account, highlights the deaths of two martyrs, Perpetua and Felicity, and records several conversations and visions which Perpetua and others had while in prison. Both of these texts reveal essential details about the state of North African Christianity. First, both texts were recorded in Latin, and both make direct quotations to passages from the New Testament.[21] This reveals the existence of a Latin passages from New Testament authors already circulating

---

[16] Apuleius produced an autobiographical sketch in which he refers to himself as, "half Numbian and half Gaetulian." Apuleius, *Apologia* XXIV. For Latin text and translation, Apuleius, "Apology," in *Apologia, Florida, De Deo Socratis*, trans. by Christopher Jones, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017), 66-7. The city where he lived was Carthage, and it is clear that his writings, though directed at times to audiences dispersed throughout the Roman Empire, were quite popular among Carthaginians, even during the time of Tertullian. Cf. Tertullian, *Apologeticum* VII.

[17] For an extensive list of Pagan sources, vid. Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003), 592-601.

[18] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* IX. xiv. Latin text and translation in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses Books VII-XI*, trans. by J. Arthur Hanson, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 124-25.

[19] These are not unlike the caricature devised by Celsus, which Origen recorded in Alexandria. Origen, "Against Celsus," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* IV, trans. by Fredrick Crombie (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 486.

[20] Tertullian recorded that the Vigellius Saturninus was the first to persecute Christians. He was the Proconsul of Africa between 180-81 C.E., meaning that the trial of the Scillitan Martyrs had to occur during this time. Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam* III. iv.

[21] In the case of the *Scillitan Martyrs*, the author directly quoted *1 Timothy* 6:16, and there is also a reference to a martyr named Speratus, who possessed a collection of Paul's writings. *The Passion of Perpetua*, *John* 16:24, and the vision of the martyr, Saturus, resembles the throne room scene of John's *Apocalypse*. "The Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. III*, trans. by E. Wallis (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 705.

within the Christian community and the origins of Latin as the preferred language of Western Christianity.[22]

A second detail demonstrates a common feature of North African Christianity—an unwavering rejection of the secular world. It is clear from the *Scillitan Martyrs* that Roman authorities misinterpreted the actions of Christians, which they viewed as an extremist rejection of Roman rule and authority. This idea is displayed in the opening plea, "We have never done ill, we have not lent ourselves to wrong, we have not spoken ill, but when ill-treated we have given thanks; because we pay heed to Our Emperor."[23] When offered a plea deal centered on them once again participating in Roman customs, they unanimously declined and instead offered thankfulness to God for their martyrdom. *The Passion of Perpetua* continued this theme of worldly rejection; however, the temptation to rejoin the popular customs was given by her father, who entreated her to apostatize and rejoin the pagan cult.[24]

The religious landscape of Carthage in the late second century represents a combination of influences that shaped the Christian community's rejection of various public practices. As a Punic Empire, the Phoenician pantheon emphasized the cults of Baal and the goddess of fertility, Tanit. Excavations of Tophets reveal the prevalence of human sacrifice within these cults, which continued for many centuries.[25] Following the extensive Romanization of the first century C.E.,

---

[22] This detail is significant, considering that both Irenaeus and Tertullian's Roman contemporary, Hippolytus, wrote exclusively in Greek during the second and third centuries. The *Passion of Perpetua* was written in both Greek and Latin, and Tertullian was fluent in both languages, though he primarily wrote in Latin. This detail indicates the status of both languages among the North African Community. For a discussion of the Greek and Latin features in the composition of the texts of the *Passion of Perpetua*, see Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 263-66. For Tertullian writing in also Greek, Tertullian, *De Corona* VI. iii.

[23] "The Passion of The Scillitan Martyrs," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* IX, trans. by A. Robinson, 285.

[24] *The Pass. of Perp.*, II.

[25] It should not go unnoticed that Herodotus was the first to record a saga concerning Carthage. In this story, the ruler, Hamilcar, achieved victory by sacrificing himself onto the pyre and thus appeasing the gods. Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. by Robin Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 463. For a discussion of various Tophets and the practice of human sacrifice in the Punic Empire, consult G. Picard, "Carthage From The Battle at Himera to Agathocles Invasion," in *CAH Vol. VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 361-380. H. Scullard, "Carthage and Rome," in *CAH Vol. VII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 514.

worship of Baal and Tanit, as well as other indigenous deities, continued but under new, Roman names. Baal was generally associated with the Roman god Saturn or Jupiter, and Tanit, a consort of Baal, with Juno.[26] Thus the local population and those from Rome could worship within the same temples while maintaining an African religious identity. This syncretizing was nothing unusual, as is attested by Apuleius's devotion to the Egyptian cult of Isis, whom he identified with several deities throughout the Roman world.[27] We may surmise further the continued popularity of these cults well into the fourth century.[28] Moreover, these cults contributed to the persecution of Christians by the local population.

Without a doubt, many North African's interpreted the lack of cultural and religious participation by Christians as a challenge to the very way of life. Persecution, in general, began as a local, popular response to a perceived threat. In Tertullian's response to the Roman Government, he once asked, "How often, too, the hostile mob, paying no attention to you, takes the law into its own hand, and assails us with stones and flames?"[29] In a religious society dependent on various deities' benevolence, the occurrence of a disaster prompted persecution of the non-compliant community. Furthermore, considering Tertullian specifically targeted this way of thinking, this must have been a continual source of persecution in Carthage.[30]

Thus, we come to the third and somewhat obvious detail expressed in these texts: martyrdom, specifically in the context of North African Christianity, formed an integral part of the Church's life and community. It is clear from Tertullian's documentation of persecution that

---

[26] David E. Wilhite, *Ancient African Christianity: An Introduction to a Unique Context and Tradition* (London: Routledge Publishing, 2017), 60.
[27] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* XI. v. Latin text and translation in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses Books VII-XI*, trans. by J. Arthur Hanson, LCL, 244-7.
[28] Peter Brown believes that the name of Augustine's mother, Monica, stems from the Punic goddess 'Mon.' Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 21.
[29] Tertullian, *Apologia* XXXVII. iii. For the English text, "Apology," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* III, trans. by S. Thelwall, 45.
[30] François Decret, *Early Christianity in North Africa*, 19. Cf. Tertullian, *Apologia* XL.

Christian burial sites were important to the ecclesial community.[31] Decades later, Cyprian referenced the liturgical function of martyr accounts used in special ceremonies and commencements at the graves of the martyrs.[32] Moreover, the liveliness of this practice was not present in other Christian communities, as Ambrose's rebuke of Augustine's mother, reveals.[33] While at the time of Tertullian, posthumous ceremonies only reinforced the unique individual status of the martyr, by the time of Cyprian and Augustine, it is clear that a belief that martyrs and confessors could pass absolution, even after death.[34]

Despite local opposition and persecution, Christianity spread beyond the urban centers of Carthage into the African countryside. In just seventy years after the *Passion of The Scillitan Martyrs*, Cyprian was able to boast that a council of his predecessor, Donatus, in the early 240s, recorded over ninety bishops present and he also accounted the opinions of eighty-seven loyal bishops at another council in 256 C.E.[35] When one considers the absence of schismatic bishops, this number was in reality, considerably higher.[36] Christianity also spread into nomadic groups in the farthest reaches of the African province.[37] Furthermore, martyrdom certainly contributed to the rise of Christianity in North Africa. Thus, when Tertullian made his famous remark, "The

---

[31] This point is intuited from Tertullian's statement, "cum de areis sepulturarum nostrarum acclamassent: 'Areae non sint!' Areae ipsorum non fuerunt: messes enim suas non egerunt." Tertullian, *Ad Scapula* III. i. For the Latin text, vid. Tertullian, "Ad Scapula," in *Tertulliani Opera Vol. II*, CCSL (Turnholti: Typocraphi Brepolis Editores Pontificii, 1954), 1129. From now on, any reference to the volumes of Tertullian's writings found in the CCSL, the citation will be the series, volume, and page number (Ex.: CCSL II, 1129).

[32] Cyprian, "Epistle XXVI," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* V, trans. by Ernest Wallis, 315.

[33] Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. by Maria Boulding (Hyde Park: New City Press, 2018), 95.

[34] For a discussion of this progression, vid. Monika Pesthy-Simon, "The Meaning of the Martyr's Sacrifice," in *Isaac, Iphigeneia, and Ignatius: Martyrdom and Human Sacrifice* (New York: Central European University Press, 2017), 171-206.

[35] Cyprian, "Epistle LIX," in *On the Church: Select Letters*, trans. by Allen Brent, PPS (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006), 155.

[36] J. Burns Jr. and Robin Jensen, *Christianity in Roman Africa: The Development of Its Practices and Beliefs* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2014), 48.

[37] In *Adversus Iudaeos*, Tertullian records the extension of Christianity, which includes a reference to the Gaetulians, a nomadic group in North Africa. Tertullian, *Adversus Iudaeos* VII. iv (CCSL II, 1354).

blood of Christians is the seed,"[38] he recognized the significant contribution of martyrdom in shaping the identity of North African Christianity. Since our study specifically addresses Tertullian's ecclesiology, let us now turn our attention to a brief biographical sketch that will assist us later in perhaps understanding certain aspects of his theology.

II. Tertullian: A Brief Biographical Sketch

The genius of Tertullian is almost unparalleled in the theological writings of the late second and early third century. A prolific writer, his ability with words and rhetoric formed a foundation for the theological tradition of North Africa. And while much can be said concerning his writings, the paucity of personal details presents a myriad of problems in generating a comprehensive biography. Thankfully, since several esteemed biographies are readily available,[39] a brief exposition will adequately provide the historical background to this famous author.

Septimus Tertullian[40] was born in Carthage, c. 170 C.E.[41] Jerome's brief biography suggests he was born to noble parents, specifically a proconsul or a centurion.[42] Barnes argues that Jerome interpreted the false transcription in *Apologeticum*, "teste militia patris nostri,"[43] which instead ought to be read as, "teste militia patriae nostrae." If the form text is correct, then

---

[38] Tertullian, *Apologia* L. xiii (CCSL I, 171). Cf. *De Fuga in Persectione* IX. iv.
[39] Over fifty years after it was written, Timothy Barnes's biography of Tertullian remains the most complete English biography on Tertullian. As such, biographies that have followed, tend to condense Barnes's meticulous work. For a recent, concise biographical sketch of Tertullian, see Geoffry Dunn, *Tertullian*, ECF (New York: Routledge Publishing, 2004).
[40] For Tertullian's *gentilicium*, vid. *De Virginibus Velandis* XVII. v (CCSL II, 1226).
[41] As with most details of Tertullian's life, there is disagreement concerning the approximate year of his birth. Some have suggested an early date as 150 C.E. [Ex.: Phillip Schaff, *History of The Christian Church Vol. II*, Fifth Ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1910), 819.]; however, Barnes deduces that Tertullian composed his earliest works in his early days and that he died shortly after his last work. Therefore, while he acknowledges it is impossible to infer an exact date, he believes that 170 C.E. to be the best assessment from extant details. Vid. Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 58.
[42] Jerome, "Lives of Illustrious Men," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Father Vol. III,* 2nd Series, trans. by Ernest Cushing (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 373.
[43] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* IX. ii (CCSL I, 102).

it would appear that the events recorded by Tertullian stem from the testimony of his father, specifically in the context of his father's military position. If the latter revision stands, then Tertullian is not speaking of his father, but instead is referencing the existence of infant sacrifices a century earlier under the rule of Emperor Tiberius.[44] Regardless of the position taken, it remains that Tertullian undoubtedly was born within a wealthier, pagan family[45] that was able to afford him an education among the growing intelligentsia of Carthage.

Tertullian's education centered on rhetoric, and considering the methodology and his appropriation of Roman legal terminology, one has to wonder whether he may have been a lawyer for a time.[46] The plausibility of this position rests in the legal vocabulary which Tertullian regularly employs. For instance, Tertullian's application of *Praescriptione* in reference to heretics, and his appropriation of the authority of baptism to the bishop as a matter of 'rights,'[47] seem to indicate that Tertullian was educated in the Roman legal tradition in Carthage.[48]

Because Tertullian never informs his readers of his exact profession, various authors' suggestions require a brief discussion and qualification. Scholars have traditionally agreed with Jerome's statement that Tertullian was a presbyter in Carthage.[49] Tertullian did express many writings which focus on ecclesial structures and authority within the Church. The weakness of this position rests in the fact that Tertullian never uses his position within the Church to

---

[44] For the full exposition of this discussion, vid. Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 13-21.
[45] Tertullian, *Paenitentia* I. i.
[46] It is not suggested here that the theologian Tertullian should be identified with the jurist Tertullianus. Barnes has sufficiently shown that these are two distinct people. There is the possibility that Tertullian of Carthage traveled to and from Rome [*De Cultu Feminarum* Lib. I., Cap. VII. ii (CCSL I, 349)]. Barnes opposes this position stating that the first-person application in discourses does not necessarily denote personal experience. Ibid., 243-5.
[47] Tertullian, *De Baptismo* XVII. i-ii (CCSL I, 291).
[48] Torjesen has composed several works on Tertullian's appropriation and development of ecclesial authority and rights taken from contemporary imperial structures. Vid. Karen J. Torjesen, "Clergy and Laity," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 399.
[49] Jerome, "Lives of Illustrious Men," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Father Vol. III,* 2nd Series, trans. by Ernest Cushing, 58. Cf. Johannes Quasten, *Patrology Vol. II* (Utrecht-Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 1975), 246-47.

strengthen his arguments.[50] Moreover, Barnes refers to several occasions where Tertullian may have placed himself as among the laity.[51] In such quotations, either a first-person plural 'we' is generally placed or there exist several critiques of the authority of clergy. These references do not necessarily mean that Tertullian was not a priest. Considering Tertullian's view on power and authority within the Church, using his authority as a formal priest would contradict the universality of that belief.[52] Secondly, just as Barnes notes that the first-person application in discourses does not necessarily denote personal experience or inclusion, likewise, the inclusion of 'we,' when addressing the universal Church, does not indicate he's not a formal authority in the Church. Thus, it would appear that Tertullian's profession also remains historically ambiguous.

There are yet a few other details that we may be able to surmise from autobiographical statements sporadically located among Tertullian's writings. Tertullian was married.[53] He had an affair.[54] And he possessed some means of wealth in his lifetime.[55]

Perhaps a detail that has received the most scholarly attention was Tertullian's relationship with the New Prophecy. Jerome recorded, "He was a presbyter of the church until the middle of his life, afterwards driven by the envy and abuse of clergy of the Roman Church, he lapsed to the doctrine of Montanus, and mentions the new prophecy in many of his books."[56] It is undeniable that Montanism influenced Tertullian in a myriad of ways, but the most significant impact was on the ethical zeal which permeated the movement.[57] The conclusion of

---

[50] Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 11.
[51] Tertullian, *Exhortatione Castitatis* VII. iii (CCSL II, 1024); *De Monogamia* XII. ii (CCSL II, 1247).
[52] This point is discussed in the Third Chapter **on pgs.**
[53] Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem* Lib. I, Cap. I. i.
[54] Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* LIX. iii.
[55] Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem* Lib. I, Cap. I. ii.
[56] Jerome, "Lives of Illustrious Men," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Father Vol. III,* 2nd Series, trans. by Ernest Cushing, 58.
[57] Tertullian, *De Jeiun.* I. iii.

Jaroslav Pelikhan that "Tertullian was drawn to Montanism, not for its theological novelty, if any, but for its moral zeal"[58] recognized the prominence that Christian ethics possessed in Tertullian's texts. However, recent scholarship highlights that there is a shared language of experience surrounding the function of divine indwelling. Nevertheless, because of the New Prophecy's schismatic nature and the fact that recent scholarship has aptly noted the shared language common to both Tertullian and the movement's founders, it is necessary to conduct a historical evaluation of the New Prophecy in North Africa.

III. The New Prophecy: A Historical Mosaic

Molding together the fragmentary history of the New Prophecy, which consequently took the name of its founder, Montanus, is like viewing a mosaic—meaningless when placed individually, but when arranged with other fragments, a picture is revealed. Thus, several historical issues form a historical picture of the New Prophecy when arranged and discussed. The first issue stems from the fact that the primary sources provide only fragments from Montanus himself, the majority of which are quoted by hostile sources who seek to use them in order to illegitimatize Montanist teachings.[59] Second, there is an evident lack of consensus among contemporary scholars on historical details such as dates and what constituted the New Prophecy's fundamental tenets. In addition to these issues, the apparent geographical breadth of the movement itself undoubtedly produced a diversity of sects within the movement. Nevertheless, scholars have been able to produce some areas of certainty. Any discussion which navigates the above issues carefully can produce such a historical Mosaic and, most importantly,

---

[58] Jaroslav Pelikan, "Montanism and Its Trinitarian Significance," *Church History* Vol. 25, No. 2 (1956): 104-5, accessed January 8, 2019, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3161195.

[59] Jerome records that even Tertullian wrote an apology of the New Prophecy, *De Ecstaci*, which consisted of only six books until the addition of a seventh book to refute Apollonius. Vid. Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* XXIV, XL, LIII.

connect critical language and teachings of the movement with that of North African Christianity and most significantly to that of Tertullian.

What can be garnered from the sources is that Montanus started to prophesy in a town called Ardabau in ancient Phrygia,[60] wherein the heresy was often identified as the "οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας" (Lat. *Cataphrygas*).[61] Eventually, two women, Priscilla and Maximilla, joined Montanus, drawing quite a following themselves. In a letter, Jerome wrote that Montanus was a eunuch which some scholars have connected to the cult of Cybele, though this is simply a conjecture.[62] The two primary ecclesial sources on origins of the New Prophecy come from the writings of Eusebius Pamphilus and Epiphanius of Salamis. Both of these sources provide similar accounts of the movement, and they record letters and texts by those who wrote against the New Prophecy; however, both writers were several centuries removed from the inception of the movement, and their writings are plagued with contradictions.

One of these contradictions center on the start of the movement. First, Eusebius contradicts himself within two of his works. In *Ecclesiastical History*, he places the starting date of the movement during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, 177 C.E.[63] However, in his work, *The Chronicle*, the date 171 C.E. is provided.[64] Epiphanius's *Panarion* traced the movement back farther, to the reign of Antonius Pius, placing it at c.157 C.E.[65] There are three possible options for interpreting the disparity between these two sources: either completely ignore the

---

[60] Ardabau is an unidentified town within a region located in the Mid.-Western part of Modern Turkey.
[61] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xvi. Cf. Epiphanius, *Pan.* XLVIII. I.
[62] Jerome, "Letter XLI," in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Vol. VI*, 2nd Series, trans. by Hon. W. H. Fremantle (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 56.
[63] According to the account, Montanism was started and spread in conjunction with a series of persecutions in Gaul contemporaneous to Irenaeus. See Eusebius of Caesarea, *H.E.* IV. xxvii; V. iii-iv.
[64] Of course, the latter date depends on the exactness of how the regnal years were calculated. See Timothy Barnes, "The Chronology of Montanism," *JTS* 21, No. 2 (1970): 403-4, accessed March 15, 2019, https://www.jstor.org/stable/23959280.
[65] Epiphanius, *Pan.* XLVIII.I.ii.

contradiction, attempt to synchronize the sources,[66] or espouse one source over the other.[67] Barnes is against a synchronizing of the two sources and instead argues for 171 C.E. He believes that since Epiphanius rejected Eusebius's combining sacred and secular history, his chronology was developed about twenty years behind Eusebius.[68] Nevertheless, there are a growing number of scholars who support synchronizing the two dates, opting for a period somewhere in the 160's C.E. range.[69] Admittedly, there are few possibilities for a scholarly consensus to be reached for a precise date,[70] moreover, it is most accurate for the present to conclude that the New Prophecy began at some point in the late second century between 160-175 C.E.[71]

A second issue with both Eusebius and Epiphanius manifests in their descriptions of Montanus and his prophetesses. They tend to designate deplorable actions that were common among heretics, highlighting inherited vices. These include youthfulness in the faith,[72] providing salaries to clerics,[73] teachings things contrary to what had been passed down by the church;[74] and these were not exclusive to certain heretics. It was common among heresiologists, to develop a

---

[66] Most prominently among the list of scholars who argues for a 156/7 C.E. date is G.S.P. Freeman-Grenville, "The Date of The Outbreak of Montanism," *JEH* 5, No. 1 (1954): 7-15, accessed March 15, 2019, doi:10.1017/s0022046900068044.

[67] For a comprehensive list of different historians who utilized the three different options, see Timothy Barnes, "The Chronology of Montanism," 404, footnotes 6-8.

[68] Ibid., 406.

[69] Christine Trevett offers c.160 C.E. in *Montanism: Gender, Authority, And The New Prophecy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 32. William Tabbernee offers 165 C.E. in *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, PMS (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997), 17.

[70] If the proconsul in *H.E.* V. xvi., Cratus, were matched with Roman records of the period, then it would be possible to chronicle the rise of Montanism. Also, since Eusebius places the origins of the New Prophecy in conjunction with persecutions in Gaul, it may be possible to surmise a more accurate periodization. Eusebius, *H.E.* V. iii.

[71] A potentially convincing piece of epigraphical evidence for a 160's C.E. date rests within the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. The section in question states, "εἷς δὲ ὀνόματι Κόϊντος, Φρὺξ προσφάτως ἐληλυθὼς ἀπὸ τῆς Φρυγίας, ἰδὼν τὰ θηρία ἐδειλίασεν…τοῦτον ὁ ἀνθύπατος πολλὰ ἐκλιπαρήσας ἔπεισεν ὀμόσαι καὶ ἐπιθυσαι." If this section is not a later addition, then the text could have been composed c. 150-160's, providing Eusebius's date for the martyrdom is correct. For the text, see Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 310. Cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* IV. xiv.

[72] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xvi.

[73] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xviii.

[74] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xvi.

type of 'heretical' line of succession placed in opposition to the apostolic succession of orthodoxy.[75] And such negative generalizations ought to be cautiously evaluated.

The name 'New Prophecy' itself indicates the centrality of the movement around prophecy, especially eschatology. The eschatological visions of the New Prophecy invoked an affinity for strict ethics. The marriage of eschatology and ethics was largely driven by the theological significance of the Holy Spirit, preferably called the Paraclete, which they believed to be a fulfillment of Johannine texts.[76] As with any apocalyptic movement, the Parousia's pronouncement was imminent and the city of Pepuza designated as the place for the descent of the New Jerusalem.[77] Because of its call to rigorous discipline, some have interpreted the New Prophecy as a reactionary movement in opposition to the moral laxity and a de-emphasis of the Holy Spirit in second century Church.[78]

While Eusebius and Epiphanius ridiculed the new Prophecy for its lack of successive prophets, the movement continued for centuries, possibly well into the sixth century. [79] It is

---

[75] Tertullian charges Marcion with similar attributes in his *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* XXX. (CCSL I, 210-2). It is also noteworthy to compare the 'heretical' line of succession of Irenaeus in which Simon Magus is considered the first in a series. His 'spiritual' descendants are said to have shared in his deplorable actions. It is perhaps from this tradition that a later fifth-century homily, attributed to Chrysostom, calls Montanus a "Son of Simon [Magus]." Vid. William Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, PMS, 40. Cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* I. xxiii.; III. iii; Eusebius*, H.E.* II. xiii.; Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* XXXII.

[76] No doubt what they considered as a fulfillment of John 16:13 which states, "ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ; οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει, λαλήσει; Καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν." Greek text, vid. Barbara Aland, et al., "ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ," in *NTG*, 28 Revised Ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012), 356-7. Cf. Matt. 23:34.

[77] Eusebius, *H. E.* V. xix; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III. Xi.; Epiphanius, *Pan*. IL. I. iii.

[78] Such is the opinion of John Chadwick in the pamphlet, *Tertullian and Montanism* (Boston: The Christian Examiner, 1863), 159-60. Some have recently argued that the movement was an anti-establishment movement, but considering the adoption of a hierarchy within the New Prophecy, this interpretation seems unlikely. John Morgan-Wynne, *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD. 90-200*, 125.

[79] Consider Tabbernee's engagement with a fragment from Pseudo-Dionysius on the bones of Montanus, which states, "By the encouragement of the holy, John, bishop of Asia, there were found the bones of Montanus…and he burned them with fire, and he uprooted their temples unto the foundations." If this is connected with the campaign which John of Ephesus wrote in his *Ecclesia Historia*, then it seems likely that a continued presence of the New Prophecy remained at least until the late fifth-sixth century. William Tabbernee, *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating the History of Montanism*, PMS, 28-29. Cf. John of Ephesus, *H. E.* III. xxxvi-vii.

unclear whether an authentic strain of Montanism continued, for if Epiphanius is correct, following the deaths of Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla, there were several sects which claimed to follow one of the prophets or claimed a connection to a specific place. [80]Augustine even wrote of a sect of 'Tertullianists' which claimed Tertullian as their originator;[81] however, it is doubtful whether Tertullian ever truly left the 'Catholic' faith.[82] Indeed divisions within the various communities led to diverse interpretations of central themes in the New Prophecy. It would seem that the centrality of the conflict rested not prophecy itself, but the manner of prophecy. Since this is a point of agreement between Tertullian and the New Prophecy, let us consider precisely what that manner of prophecy was.

III.1: Language of Self-Commendation and Divine Indwelling:

The focus of the conflict over the so-called 'Phrygian Heresy' centered on the prophetic manner in which Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla's performed their oracles. For example, Eusebius describes the Montanus's prophetic demeanor as,

> ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ψυχῆς ἀμέτρῳ φιλοπρωτείας δόντα πάροδον εἰς ἑαυτὸν τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ πνευματοφορηθῆναί τε καὶ αἰφνιδίως ἐν κατοχῇ τινι καὶ παρεκστάσει γενόμενον ἐνθουσιᾶν ἄρξασθαί τε λαλεῖν καὶ ξενοφωνεῖν…[83]

The sibylline oracles of the prophetesses resembled that of Montanus, which the Anonymous writer of Eusebius described as *ἐκφρων* and *ἄκαιρος*.[84] Miltiades, when he responded against the manner of prophecy wrote, "ἀλλ᾽ ὅ γε ψευδοπροφήτης ἐν παρεκστάσει, ᾧ ἔπεται ἄδεια καὶ ἀφοβία, ἀρχομένου μὲν ἐξ ἐκουσίου ἀμαθίας, καταστρέφοντος δὲ εἰς ἀκούσιον μανίαν ψυχῆς…"[85]

---

[80] Epiphanius, *Pan.* IL.
[81] Augustine, *De Haer.* LXXXVI.
[82] Douglas Powell, "Tertullianists and Cataphrygians." *VC* 29, no. 1 (1975): 33-54. Accessed June 30, 2020. doi:10.2307/1582900.
[83] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xvi. For the Greek text, vid. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, trans. by Kirsopp Lake, LCL, 474.
[84] Defined as 'ecstatic' and 'un-timely/in-opportune.' Ibid.,.
[85] Ibid., 174.

Since he also praises Ammias and Quadratus, both of whom he considered to have genuinely possessed the prophetic spirit, it would seem Miltiades's issue was not prophecy, but the ecstatic manner of the prophets.[86] Such bizarre ramblings were only assumed to be a consequence of demons, which led to the failed exorcism of the demon from Priscilla.[87] Drawing special attention towards this event, John Morgan-Wynne argues that, "The catholic bishops' attempt to exorcise the leaders of Montanism reveals an acceptance of possession/inspiration, but a belief in its demonic origin."[88]

It is possible to deduce from the fragmentary quotations from the prophets of the New Prophecy that they interpreted their oracles as a type of 'possession,' or 'indwelling' (Gk. *ἐνοικέω*).[89] Notably, a vast majority of the recited oracles are 'I am' statements, which presumably initiated larger discourses by the prophets.[90] For example, Montanus is recorded as declaring, "ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ καταγινόμενος ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ."[91] Elsewhere he states, "οὔτε ἄγγελος οὔτε πρέσβυς, ἀλλ᾽ἐγὼ κυριος ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ἦλθον."[92] An anonymous source recorded Maximilla as saying, "ῥῆμά εἰμι καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις."[93] Some of the Catholic sources considered these oracles to mean that Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla were all claiming to be God or the persons of the Godhead; however, such oracles of "self-

---

[86] That there was a common expectation within various Christian communities for a continuation of prophetic gifting is illustrated by the provisions of prophets in the *Didache* and the wide circulation of *Hermas* in the first and second centuries. Cf. *Didache* XI.iii; Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xviii.
[87] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xix. Greek text, vid. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, trans. by Kirsopp Lake, LCL, 494.
[88] John Morgan-Wynne, *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD. 90-200*, 122.
[89] Epiphanius, *Pan.* XLVIII. XI. vi. Similarly, Hippolytus of Rome used *χωρέω* and *πλέως* to invoke the idea of 'indwelling' in *Ref. Her.* VIII. xix. For the Greek text, vid. Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*, trans. by M. David Litwa (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 612.
[90] David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and The Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1983), 315.
[91] Epiphanius, *Pan.* XLVIII. XI. i.
[92] It is important to note that the majority of Montanus's 'I am' oracles are Trinitarian proclamations. For a concise list, consult *Pan.* XLVIII. XI. ix.
[93] Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xvi.

commendation," more than likely reinforced the passivity of the prophet.[94] Therefore, Montanus's proclamation, "ἰδού, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὡσεὶ λύρα κἀγὼ ἐφίπταμαι ὡσεὶ πλῆκτρον; ὁ ἄνθρωπος κοιμᾶται κἀγὼ γρηγορῶ. ἰδού, κύριός ἐστιν ὁ ἐξιστάνων καρδίας ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδοὺς καρδίαν ἀνθρώποις,"[95] supports the interpretation of Henry Swete that Montanus's methods may have been more "fanatical rather than profane."[96]

Maximilla and Priscilla likewise appeared to have understood their prophecies via a similar lens, yet their oracles reflect more self-awareness on their part as prophets. This is represented in Maximilla's statement, "ἀπέστειλέ με κύπιος τούτου τοῦ πόνου καὶ τῆς συνθήκης καὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αἱρετιστὴν μηνυτὴν ἑρμνευτήν, ἠναγκασμένον, θέλοντα καὶ μὴ θέλοντα, γνωθεῖν γνῶσιν θεοῦ."[97] Based on the responses of Eusebius's sources and Epiphanius, it seems that a significant point of contention between the two groups was how to interpret such prophetic passivity. The proponents of the New Prophecy viewed it as a sign of divine inspiration. In the eyes of those against the movement, such an invasive spirit could only be defined as demonic.[98] Understanding this conflict, it is clear that Tertullian's adoption of Montanism influenced his descriptions of prophecy. Let us then consider the relationship between Tertullian and the New Prophecy in the context of North Africa.

---

[94] David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and The Ancient Mediterranean World*, 70-2; Examples of this type of self-commendation frequently appear in the Jewish sibylline oracles of the Second and Third Centuries. In Oracle Bk. II, the writer initiates the oracle by stating, "I will speak the following with my whole person in ecstasy for I do not know what I say, but God bids me utter each thing." James Charlesworth eds., "The Sibylline Oracles: Book 2," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol. I: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, trans. by J.J. Collins (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 1983), 345.

[95] Epiphanies, *Pan.* XLVIII. iv. Greek text and translation, vid. Ronald Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*, PMS 14 (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989), 32-33. Similarly, the early Apologists utilized the metaphor of instruments when describing the prophetic work of the Prophets. Cf. Justin Martyr, *Hortatory Address to The Greeks*, VIII; Athenagoras, *A Plea for The Christians*, IX.

[96] Henry B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in The Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in The Age of The Fathers*, 70.

[97] Epiphanies, *Pan.* XLVIII. XIII. i.

[98] Thus, Epiphanius's response of "οὕτως καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσε μετὰ προαιρέσεως κέκληκεν οὐκ ἀνάγκην ἐπιβαλλων, οὐ κλοιὸν ἐπιτιθέμενος." Pan. XLVIII. XIII. iv. Ronald Heine, *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*, PMS 14, 32-33.

III.2: Tertullian and Montanism: A Shared Language of Divine Indwelling:

There is a considerable amount of ambiguity surrounding Tertullian's adoption of Montanism. Considering the chronological and geographical distance between Tertullian and Montanus, it is not surprising that there were various doctrinal differences between different sects. As stated earlier, the epigraphical evidence reveals diversity among different sects on the Doctrine of the Trinity.[99] Furthermore, another difference may be surmised from the famous debate between the Montanist Proclos and the Catholic Gaius, on the superiority of apostolic or prophetic trophies.[100] Considering Tertullian's understanding of power and authority, this topic would have indeed appeared trivial to him.[101] Despite these differences, the New Prophecy offered a preferable framework that parodied Tertullian's own passions. As John Chadwick once opined, unlike the other systems which Tertullian abhorred (i.e., Gnosticism), "Montanism [was] a matter of the heart."[102] It is also challenging to understand Montanism through the lens of Tertullian because most likely, considering Tertullian's wit and rhetoric, the New Prophecy was influenced by Tertullian as much as he was influenced by it. Thus, Trevett mourns the often-erroneous positing of Tertullian's teachings onto the New Prophecy in Asia and Rome, and vice

---

[99] Hippolytus records at least two sects of Phrygians, which held differing views on the Trinity in *Ref. Haer.* VIII. xix. Cf. Tertullian in *Adver. Prax*. Epiphanius, *Pan.* XL VIII. iv.

[100] Christine Trevett argues this interpretation for the list of prophets that Miltiades references combined with Maximilla's seeming recognition of being commissioned in Epiphanius. Eusebius's description of the debate seemingly adds validity to this interpretation. Eusebius, *H.E.* V. xvii; Epiphanius, *Pan.* XLVIII. xiii. Cf. Acts, 11:28, 15:22, 27, 32, 21:10; For a full exposition of Trevett's argument, consult *Montanism: Gender, Authority, And The New Prophecy*, 33-4. Cf. Eusebius, *H.E.* II. xxv; VI. xx; V. xvii. For a reference to Proclos in Tertullian, vid. *Adversus Valentinianos* V. i.

[101] Consider Tertullian's view that those who resided in offices that claimed direct descent from an Apostle had only received doctrine, not any extraordinary power or authority. Further, the keys given to Peter were to him alone, and they were not handed down. Consequently, Tertullian could claim that special powers, such as the ability to forgive sins, were the *arbitrium ius* of God. As he further explained, "Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerous episcorum. Domini enim, non famuli est ius et arbitrium; Dei ipsius, non socerdotis." Therefore, an argument of the validity of either the Montanist or the Roman trophies would have been inconsequential. Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. xvi (CCSL II, 1328).

[102] As he thoroughly argues, "As they [the two systems] struggle forth into conscious expression, they have nothing in common but an unmistakable hostility to the regular development of the Church. Gnosticism was a thing of the intellect, Montanism a matter of the heart." John Chadwick, *Tertullian and Montanism*, 161.

versa.[103] While that may very well be the case, developing the picture of the New Prophecy in North Africa is highly dependent upon the writings of its most famous adherent.[104]

Tertullian was not always a proponent of the New Prophecy, which is apparent from the shift in tone in his later writings. It is clear from the several allusions to the victory of Emperor Septimius over Clodius Albinus between 196/97 C.E.[105] that *Ad Nationes* and *Ad Martyras* were composed shortly thereafter.[106] And yet, it was not until almost a decade later, c. 207/11 C.E. that the earliest references to the New Prophecy appear within various texts.[107] Perhaps the latest allusion to an event, and therefore, Tertullian's last work is *Ad Scapulam*, which references the eclipse of the Sun in August 212 C.E.[108] If Tertullian died shortly after that, then it would mean that Tertullian's Montanist period would consist of only roughly 1-5 years, a relatively short time. The fact that there exists a progression in style and tone among Tertullian's vast corpus requires some qualification about a chronology of Tertullian's works; however, we must be careful not to view the Pre-Montanist and Post-Montanist Tertullian as two separate people.

---

[103] Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority, And The New Prophecy*, 66-67.

[104] There is an ongoing debate as to whether the *Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas* can be regarded as a "Montanist" Martyr account. Everyone recognizes the prophetic tone of opening *exordium*; however, how to interpret those 'tones' remains a matter of contention. There are three significant positions on how to interpret the *Passion*: First, the *Passion* was itself a work redacted by 'R,' who sought to reveal the contemporary validity of Prophecy. Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority, And The New Prophecy*, 176-177; Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 79; Thomas Hefferman, *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 10-11. Second, is that the redactor is hesitantly accepted as either Montanistic, or held a similar persuasion towards prophecy, but only minimally. John Morgan-Wynne, *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD. 90-200*, 223; J.F. Matthews, review of *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, by Timothy Barnes, *Journal of Theological Studies* Vol. 24 (1973), accessed April 3, 2019, http://www.tertullian.org/articles/barnes_jts_review.htm. The third and final view is that the supposed redactor was in no way a Montanist. William Weinrich, *Spirit and Martyrdom: A Study of The Work of The Holy Spirit in Contexts of Persecution and Martyrdom in The New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1981), 228-36.

[105] Tertullian, *Ad Martyras* VI. ii (CCSL I, 8); *Ad Nationes* Liber I. XVII. iv (CCSL I, 31). Cf. *Apologeticum* XXXV. ix-xi.

[106] Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 32-4; Postscript notes, 328.

[107] Barnes initially believed that the first Montanist references in *Adversus Marcionem* Lib. III. XXIV. iv; Lib. IV, XXII. iv, were composed in c. 207/8 C.E. In his revised edition, he rejected this previous date and instead argued for an unspecified later date. Ibid., 46; 328.

[108] Ibid., 38.

Barnes devised several themes and ideas which spate Tertullian's Pre-Montanist and Post-Montanist years.[109] This includes the following: Direct naming of any of the three prophets (i.e., Montanus, Priscilla, or Maximilla).[110] References to the New Prophecy or a 'new discipline.'[111] Commendation of prophetic trances and mentions of spiritual gifts exclusive to Montanists.[112] References to the Holy Spirit as 'Paraclete.'[113] And finally, pronouns such as 'Vos' or 'Vester' to contrast 'psychici' and Montanists.[114] And a text can have any number of these ideas in them.[115]

We must be careful in establishing boundaries between two periods in Tertullian's life that we do not start to consider Tertullian as two separate writers. Even with the shift of tone and the shared language of indwelling, which amplified Tertullian's pneumatology, he remains highly consistent in his reflections.[116] Prophetic themes or references to continued prophetic ministry does not necessarily indicate a Montanist text. For instance, in *De Idolotria*, Tertullian applied a vision of a man to support further God's rejection of hanging wreaths over doorways and gates.[117] Later, as a Montanist, he espoused the Holy Spirit's prophetic operation, finding an example in spontaneous prophesying of King Saul in the Hebrew Bible.[118] Thus, the operation of the Holy Spirit, as the revealer of all truth, exists in both periods of Tertullian's writings.

---

[109] For a comprehensive list, Ibid., 55; 328.
[110] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* Lib. III, Cap. XXIV. iv; Lib. V, Cap. VIII. xi; XV. v; XVI. iv; *Adversus Praxean* I. v; *De Anima* LV. v; *Exhortatione Castitatis* X. v; *De Fuga in Persecutione* IX. iv. *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* XI. ii.
[111] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* Lib. IV, Cap. XXII. iv; *De Corona Militis* I. iv.
[112] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* Lib. I, Cap. XXIX. iv;
[113] *Adversus Praxean* VIII. v; IX. iii; *Adversus Marcionem* Lib. I, Cap. XXIX. iv.
[114] *Adversus Valentinianos* V. i; *De Jejunio* I. i.
[115] Barnes provides a simple chart with references on page 44.
[116] David Rankin, *Tertullian and The Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 50.
[117] Tertullian, *De Idolotria* XV. vii-viii (CCSL II, 1116). Barnes places this text at some point after *Apologeticum* c. 197 C.E. Ibid., 325.
[118] Tertullian, *De Anima* XII. iv-v. Cf. 1 *Samuel* 10:6.

Despite the uniformity of Tertullian's theology, there is a strengthening and a shifting of emphasis, which especially occurs in his commendations of prophetic trances. In the texts composed during Tertullian's Montanist period, it is clear that Tertullian adopted a view of prophetic 'possession'[119] which mirrored that of the New Prophecy. In one instance, Tertullian utilized a prophetic 'trance' as a defense for the Apostle Peter:

> qua defendimus in causa nouae prophetiae gratiae exstasin, id est amantiam, conuenire? In spiritu enim homo constitutes, praesertim cum gloriam dei conspicit uel cum per ipsum deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet uirtute diuina…Et ita quod dixit, scilicet in spiritu non in sensu constitutes, scire non poterat.[120]

Another trance is also associated with Adam, which Tertullian described as an "ecstasin spiritalem."[121] Elsewhere, Tertullian indicates that the revelation and speaking of the Paraclete continued via the Prophets of the movement.[122] When identifying specific prophets, he echoes the prophetic emphasis on passivity, applying various metaphors, though nonetheless similar to the ones employed by the Montanist Prophets.[123] As evidence of the passivity or 'possession' of the Spirit, Tertullian takes 1 Samuel 10:6, to mean that the indwelling of the Holy Spirit upon Saul, which caused him to prophesy, meant that Saul ceased to be Saul for a moment. Thus, the questions of the crowd, "Quid hoc filio Cis? An et Saul in prophetis?"[124] The source of this shared experience of prophetic 'ecstasy' is the affirmation that the Paraclete's indwelling meant

---

[119] Christian writers of Late Antiquity were split on the idea of "divine mediumistic possession." Clint Tibbs has presented a fairly convincing case that at least until the early third century, many in Early Christianity described a type of divine possession, which was not unlike the demonic possession of the New Testament. Clint Tibbs, "Mediumistic Divine Possession among Early Christians: A Response to Craig S. Keener's 'Spirit Possession as a Cross-Cultural Experience,'" *BBR*. 26, No. 2 (2016): 173-194, accessed March 15, 2019, doi: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26371648.
[120] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* Lib. IV, Cap. XXII. iv-v. (CCSL I, 601).
[121] Tertullian, *De Jejunio* III. ii.
[122] "qui ipsum Paracletum in prophetis nouis habeo dicentum…" Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. vi (CCSL II, 1326).
[123] Tertullian, *De Resurr.* II.
[124] Tertullian, *De Anima* XI. v (CCSL II, 797).

the 'divine passion' could only be understood as divine in its origin.[125] Thus, it is clear that, like the New Prophecy, there existed in Tertullian a shared language of experience that shaped the belief that the Holy Spirit's indwelling meant that prophetic revelation was conducted via a type of 'divine possession.'

There is much more than could be said concerning the nature of progressive revelation as a consequence of divine indwelling, but this discussion will be postponed until the third chapter. For now, the historical setting of North African Christianity is evident. The periods of persecution and the diverse religious and cultural landscape of North Africa posed several challenges to the Christian communities. Martyrdom shaped the growth and ecclesial experiences of the local community. Tertullian's genius and the vast amount of extant writings help us form a broad picture of North African Christianity. And Montanism, with the ecstatic nature of its prophecy, created a shared language of prophetic experience that Tertullian drew upon or, at the very least, commonly communicated.

In the following chapter, let us now turn our attention towards Tertullian's Pneumatology, specifically his association of the divine substance and Spirit. If Tertullian did understand the divine substance as both substance and person, then it is possible to understand the divine indwelling of the Spirit within the Church as both personal and substantive, constructing then a profoundly personal experience of Spirit indwelling, while also recognizing the unity of the Divine Spirit and therefore the unity of the Ecclesial Community.

[125] Tertullian, while explaining the visions of Daniel, reassures his audience that it was God, not Daniel's fasting, which led to an 'ecstaci acturae." Ecstatic prophecy, then, is only received as an act of divine benefaction. Tertullian, *De Anima* XLVIII. iv (CCSL II, 854-5).

CHAPTER 2: DIVINE SUBSTANCE AND SPIRIT

The year was c. 211 C.E.[126] and the coastal horizon was dotted with ships coming and going from the bustling port city of Carthage. The vast amounts of precious metals such as gold and silver from the surrounding regions ensured a steady amount of trade ships from major centers of the Roman Empire. Such trading benefitted the churches scattered throughout the Empire, enabling them to communicate with relative ease. In all probability, it was one of these ships which carried a letter from one of the churches in Rome concerning a man named Praxeas, who taught in line with Sabellian dogma, that it was the Father who became flesh and was crucified. Along with this heresy, he also preached against the New Prophecy and its proponents, calling for a rejection of the movement by the Roman churches.

For nearly a decade, the Christian community in Carthage had enjoyed little, if any, animosity from local authorities. Persecution was scarce, and as such, the necessity for apologetical writings was minimal. During this time, Tertullian focused his attention on Christian discipline and morality, teachings that were akin to those proclaimed in the New Prophecy. Nevertheless, the news that the bishop of Rome had accepted the council of Praxeas presented a new challenge for Tertullian. Provoked by anger, he penned the two grievances of Praxeas, "He drove out prophecy and introduced heresy: he put to flight the Paraclete and crucified the Father."[127]

Today, it is widely recognized that Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean* is one of the most significant works of theology in the Western tradition. Notably, the text is the first to widely use the term *Trinitas* as a description of the Godhead, and Tertullian was the first to develop the

[126] Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 55; 328.
[127] Tertullian, *Treatise Against Praxeas*, trans. by Ernest Evans (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1948), 131.

distinction between *substantia* and *persona*, which eventually gave rise to the familiar Trinitarian dictum—three persons in one substance. As the centuries progressed, the councils and creeds which developed therein adopted the language of 'substance,' owing this language to its founder, and further refining the term from its suggested novice application in Tertullian. However, this appropriation of the term substance by later authors has sometimes distracted the attention of scholars and translators from its particular usage and use in Tertullian's corpus, especially in references outside of its Trinitarian context in *Adversus Praxean*. Further, because of its varied philosophical use among schools of thought in Antiquity, there is yet another realm of ambiguity which historically has generated extremely lengthy, however necessary, discussions.

The following chapter is comprised of three sections: Section I analyzes the philosophical application of *substantia* in two primary schools of thought, Peripatetic and Stoic. Section II categorizes and establishes three primary usages of *substantia* in Tertullian, concentrating on its ontological function, which established a boundary of thought for Trinitarian discourse. Section III continues the discussion of the previous section, revealing that Tertullian's application of *substantia* informs his Pneumatology and his understanding of divine indwelling. As will be shown, the Holy Spirit's operation, in its relation to the divine substance, is not unlike the Spirit's role in the Church. As the Spirit manifested itself in prophetic utterance, it was the close association of the divine substance with the Spirit, that allowed Tertullian to assert that the Holy Spirit's operation was ever more present in his context as it was in the writings of old. Therefore, understanding the history, contextual application, and purpose of *substantia* in Tertullian's thought is essential to our understanding of Tertullian's Ecclesia Spiritus.

I: Substantia in Antiquity: Peripatetic and Stoic Applications

The term *substantia* (Gk. *οὐσία*) has a prominent position in Western thought. On the one hand, its reprised use in metaphysical and ontological discourse throughout antiquity provided a universally recognized application for the term. On the other hand, because of its frequent use, the term proved to be quite malleable, with various nuances easily attached to the concept—two prominent schools, the Peripatetic and Stoic, primarily utilized *substantia* prominently and in somewhat distinct ways. The relevance of these two schools in the present discussion, on the one hand, is due to their popularity among thinkers in Late Antiquity. On the other hand, because these two schools' approaches remain antithetical to one another, our comprehension of their differing approaches to the application *substantia* constitutes a historically organic structure for our discussion.

I.1: Peripatetic Application of Substantia:

In the case of the Peripatetic, those attributed to this school are often characterized as the heirs of Aristotle.[128] Consequentially, a vast majority of this philosophical school, was devoted to writing expositions and commentaries of Aristotle's writings. However, to call these heirs of Aristotle proponents of Aristotelianism would be a misnomer, since, despite their indebtedness to the writings of Aristotle, they were nevertheless quite critical of his philosophy. Furthermore, whenever Aristotelian language failed to describe their perspectives, it was not unusual for them to cling to language found in other schools, most notably Neo-Platonism.[129]

---

[128] The nomenclature of philosophical schools in antiquity tended to originate either from the location of the school (i.e., Stoicism from the Greek *στοά* meaning 'porch' or 'colonnade.') or the activity of the school. In the case of the Peripatetic, it was the activity of 'walking' or *περίπατος*, which later writers derived the name. Cf. Han Baltussen, *The Peripatetics: Aristotle's Heirs 322 BCE – 200CE* (London: Rutledge, 2016), 2.

[129] While this characterization of the Peripatetic school may seem unintuitive, Han Baltussen's research and consequent reflection on previous approaches to intellectual historiography necessitate this identification. While it is highly recommended reading his reflection in its entirety, may this brief excerpt suffice as a defense: "The traditional story of Aristotle as the lone genius and a subsequent decline of the school rests on a particular approach to writing the history of philosophy and blankly accepts that the slender evidence for his successors is sufficient to

Perhaps the most significant contribution to philosophical metaphysics given by the Peripatetic school was the distinction between *primary* and *secondary substances* (Gk. *πρῶται οὐσίαι* and *δευτέραι οὐσίαι*). The distinction, first elucidated by Aristotle in *The Categories* and later expounded in *Metaphysics*, provided a foundation for ontological discourse, in particular, understanding what constitutes the distinction between a particular/individual and a non-particular/universal (i.e., species or genus). In the case of primary substances, Aristotle states, "Οὐσία δέ ἐστιν ἡ κυριώτατά τε και πρώτως καὶ μάλιστα λεγομένη, ἣ μήτε καθ᾽ ὑποκειμένου τινὸς λέγεται μήτ᾽ ἐν ὑποκειμένου τινί ἐστιν, οἷον ὁ τὶς ἄνθρωπος ἢ ὁ τὶς ἵππος."[130] The *πρώτη οὐσία*, therefore, determines the particular thing, which is denoted here by demonstrative *ὁ τὶς* in the given examples. Elsewhere, in *Metaphysics*, the *οὐσία* of a thing is predicated to its existence, defined as "τί ἐστιν καὶ τόδε τι."[131] Aristotle continues this definition by explaining that those things, which are either operations or of a 'quality,' subsist in the primary substance, but they are not *the* substance.[132] As Marc Cohen succinctly explains,

> Although there is metaphysical structure to the fact that, e.g., *this horse is white* (a certain quality inheres in a certain substance), the fact that *this is a horse* is a kind of brute fact, devoid of metaphysical structure. This horse is a primary substance, and *horse*, the species to which it belongs, is a secondary substance.[133]

---

draw broad and authoritative conclusions. To place the emphasis on 'decline' after Aristotle, a notion already intimated by Cicero, wrongly implies that one is entitled to expect each successor to be a 'new Aristotle'… But it is clear that these qualities [of Aristotle] had both a stimulating and a restrictive effect on the activities of his successors: stimulating because Aristotle's explorations and insights triggered further research; restrictive because his body of work made great demands on his students…" Han Baltussen, *The Peripatetics: Aristotle's Heirs 322 BCE – 200CE*, 158.

[130] Aristotle, *The Categories*, trans. by Harold P. Cook, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), 18.

[131] Aristotle, *Metaphysics: Books I-IX*, trans. by Hugh Tredennick, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933), 310.

[132] As Aristotle states, "ὅτι τὸ μὴ καθ᾽ὑποκειμένου ἀλλὰ καθ᾽οὗ δεῖ δὲ μὴ μόνον οὕτως..." Vid. Aristotle, *Metaphysics Z.III*, lines 9-10.

[133] S. Marc Cohen, "Aristotle's Metaphysics," edited by Edward N. Zalta, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (2016), accessed February 23, 2020, https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/aristotle-metaphysics/.

Thus, at least for Aristotle, 'self-subsistence' and that which can be considered as 'immutable' is a programmatic distinction drawn between primary and secondary substances.[134]

The 'non-particular' aspects of ontology, Aristotle defines as *δευτέραι οὐσία* and they retain their distinction as being posterior to the primary substance of a thing. Aristotle therefore defines secondary substance as,

> δεύτεραι δὲ οὐσίαι λέγονται, ἐν οἷς εἴδεσιν αἱ πρώτως οὐσίαι λεγόμεναι ὑπάρχουσι, ταῦτά τε καὶ τὰ τῶν εἰδῶν τούτων γένη, οἷον ὁ τὶς ἄνθρωπος ἐν εἴδει μὲν ὑπαρχει τῷ ἀνθπώπῳ, γένος δὲ τοῦ εἴδους ἐστὶ τὸ ζῷον; δεύτεραι οὖν αὗται λὲγονται οὐσίαι, οἷον ὃ τε ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὸ ζῷον.[135]

The categories of form, matter, or essence, Aristotle considered to be posterior to the ontology of a subject, were sequentially secondary to a subject's ontology.[136]

Now admittedly, the above descriptions do not provide more than vague analogies of a distinction somewhat obvious to most thinkers in Antiquity.[137] Furthermore, while Aristotle himself dedicated a thousand or so lines to answer the question of what 'is' *πρῶται οὐσίαι*, that question is never truly succinctly answered. That may have been the point. As a consequence of Aristotle's relative vagueness, some scholars have challenged the overly technical application of the terms *πρῶται* and *δευτέραι οὐσίαι* by Aristotle himself and instead have suggested interpreting the terms as foundations for programmatic application.[138]

---

[134] Aristotle, *Metaphysics Z*, lines 20-25.
[135] Aristotle, *The Categories*, trans. by Harold P. Cook, LCL, 18-20.
[136] Aristotle, *Metaphysics Z.II*, lines 3-8. This is what Michael Wedin calls the "Priority Argument." For a more in-depth into the ontological consequences of this argument, see Michael Wedin, "The Structure and Substance of Substance," in *Aristotle's Theory of Substance: The Categories and Metaphysics Zeta* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 172-176.
[137] The question of the 'One and The Many' is perhaps one of the most ancient questions in all of Greek philosophy, no doubt due to it being a prominent phenomenon. Reginald Allen has notably pointed out that the first recorded disagreement between philosophers centered on this very question. This question sparked differing worldviews as each philosopher devised a cosmology based on the answer to this question. For a more in-depth discussion of this question, and others like it before Aristotle, see Reginald Allen, introduction to *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Aristotle* (New York: The Free Press, 1991), 1-21.
[138] Stead provides evidence for this interpretation specifically in *Metaphysics*, where Aristotle describes *πρῶται οὐσίαι* as the "most general possible reality" and elsewhere, he ascribes the term to both 'form' and 'essence.' See Christopher Stead, "Substance After Aristotle," in *Divine Substance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 115.

Over time the distinction heralded by Aristotle was challenged by several Peripatetics and for differing reasons. Those with affinities for Platonism found the distinction awkward at best, and they preferred to reverse the order of primary and secondary substances. As Christopher Stead notes, "Their [Neo-Platonists] fundamental distinction was drawn between perceptible substances, considered as composite and perishable, and intelligible substances, regarded as simple and immutable."[139] Indeed, Aristotle's ascription of preferential ontology to the particular embarrassed some who instead wished to ascribe preferential ontology to universals and non-particulars. Perhaps it is for this reason that later Peripatetic commentators of the Categories tended to avoid the terms πρῶται and δευτέραι οὐσίαι as technical terms for the particular and the non-particular altogether.[140] However, despite the later commentators' variant applications, almost all of them constructed metaphysical systems via a similar, Aristotelian lens. Therefore, it is not surprising that those who had an affinity for Platonism used other phrases and terms to express distinctions described by more traditional members of the school, even if they were reversed in its application.[141] Stoicism, in contrast, upheld a very different worldview, and therefore, provided a unique system in which the term *substantia* provided at times a necessary foundation for its system of cosmology and ontology.

I.2: Stoic Application of Substantia:

Stoics viewed the world as a cohesive unit, evolving within a set order of processes. In this way, a monistic system is generally ascribed to Stoics who, in recognizing apparent differences within the universe, believed that an intelligent, firelike 'spirit' remained present in

---

[139] Ibid.,.

[140] One convincing example of this interpretation is that Porphyry notably uses *ἄτομοι οὐσίαι* whenever discussing *πρῶται οὐσίαι*. Ibid., 117.

[141] Some of these phrases/terms noted by Stead are as follows: *τὰ καθ'ἕκαστα* (things each-for-each) *τὰ κατὰ μέρος* (particular things), or *ἄτομα* (atoms). Ibid., 116.

all things. This belief extended into their idea of the divine, which they describe as 'mind,'[142] Logos,[143] or the *inest principatus* of the cosmos.[144] The famous Roman Emperor and philosopher, Marcus Aurelius, best exemplified this perspective when he reflected, "Πάντα ἀλλήλοις ἐπιπλέκεται καὶ ἡ σύνδεσις ἱερά, καὶ σχεδόν τι οὐδὲν ἀλλότριον ἄλλο ἄλλῳ. Συγκατατέττακται γὰρ καὶ συγκοσμεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν κόσμον. Κοσμος τε γὰρ εἷς ἐξ ἁπάντων, καὶ θεὸς εἷς διὰ πάντων, καὶ οὐσία μία, καὶ νόμος εἷς…"[145] Naturally, the immanence of a rational 'spirit' in nature necessitated an overly materialistic system, in which a single material or *οὐσία* permeated the universe. As Stead summarizes, "Stoicism postulates a single basic constituent material endowed with a constructive organizing power, and similarly considers the universe, in its developed phase, as permeated by a rational principle…"[146] Therefore, the term *οὐσία* was many times, especially in theological discourse, placed alongside the term 'matter' (Gk. *ὕλη*) or, depending on the context, synonymous with it.[147]

Stoic philosophy recognized two primary, yet interdependent, categories of ontology: 'something' (Gk. *τὶ*), and 'bodies' (Gk. *σωμάτα*). The Stoic *τὶ* has already been discussed at length, since the universal spirit or *οὐσία* is attributed to this category. However, *σωμάτα*, as a primary category of ontology, were objects or subjects of perceivable reality. Things which existed or were considered 'real' were said to possess *σωμάτον*.[148] In each given body, there was

---

[142] Seneca, *Natural Questions* I.13.
[143] Diogenes Laertius, "Zenonis Fragmenta et Placita," in *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta Vol. I*, 43. Cf. Alexander Aphrodisias, "De Mundo," in *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta Vol. II*, 171. References to passages from these volumes will follow the same format as CCSL (Ex.: SVF II, 171).
[144] Cicero, *De Natura Deorum Academica* II.30.
[145] As a Roman source for Stoicism, Marcus Aurelius provides a great glimpse at the development of Stoicism briefly before and contemporaneous with Tertullian. Vid. Marcus Aurelius, "Meditations VII," in *Marcus Aurelius*, ed. by C. R. Haines, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), 168.
[146] Stead, "Substance After Aristotle," in *Divine Substance*, 119.
[147] As is exemplified in quotations attributed to Zeno. Diogenes Laertius (SVF I, 24). Cf. Quotations of Chrysippus by Alexander Aphrodisias, *De Mixtione*; and Plotinus, *Ennead* VI. xxvi (SVF II, 112-3).
[148] Notably, Plutarch in *The Principle of Cold* applies *οὐσία* to invoke existence, making its application capable of synonymy with *σωμάτον* in Stoic ontology. Vid. Plutarch, *On the Principle of Cold* IV.

a substrate known as 'quality' (Gk. *ποιότης*), which coexisted within bodies.[149] Later Stoics applied set categories which included *ποιότης*, though these were generally regarded as "temporary states"[150] or 'passive' principles, posterior to the ontology of a body, though they were bodies. In this way, while a given *σωμάτον* could have qualities such as weight, size, color, etc., these were thought to be distinct from the primary ontology of a given body; instead, they were considered expressions or dispositions of the *σωμάτον*, and more importantly, of the *τὶ*.[151] Furthermore, qualities found within these bodies could also include more abstract qualities, i.e., the arts, virtues, and vices, all of which were also considered to possess corporality,[152] a corporality that was nevertheless distinct yet interrelated with other bodies.[153]

Of course, the logic of Stoic *σωμάτον* and *ποιότης* reads very similar to Aristotle's distinction of *πρῶται* and *δευτέραι οὐσίαι*, which naturally invokes the question, what exactly was the relationship between a 'body' and a body's *ὕλη* or *materia*? Put differently, is the material of a given body then the same as the category of primary substance? If the answer to this question is affirmative, then it follows that the *ὕλη* of a given body is always then in a

---

[149] Early Stoicism recognized four primary material elements: air, water, fire, and earth. In each of these elements were opposing, incorporeal qualities, such as wet and dry, hot and cold, which in themselves were considered non-existent; however, they still possessed ontology in that they were corporeal. For a more general discussion, vid. J.R. Mattingly, "Early Stoicism and The Problem of Its Systematic Form," *The Philosophical Review* 48, no. 3 (1939), 276-7, accessed March 26, 2020, doi:10.2307/2180639.

[150] Stead, "Substance After Aristotle," in *Divine Substance*, 123. Cf. Margaret E. Reesor, "Fate and Possibility in Early Stoic Philosophy," Phoenix 19, no.4 (1965), 286, accessed February 24, 2020, doi:10.2307/1085828.

[151] As Plotinus explains, "Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς τέτταρα τιθέντας καὶ τετραχῶς διαιροῦντας εἰς ὑποκείμενα καὶ μοιὰ καὶ πὼς ἔχοντα καὶ πρός τί πως ἔχοντα, καὶ κοινόν τι ἐπ᾽αὐτῶν τιθέντας καὶ ἑνὶ γένει περιλαμβάνοντας τὰ πάντα…" For the Greek text, vid. Plotinus, "Ennead VI," in *Plotinus Vol. VI*, trans. by A. H. Armstrong, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 88.

[152] It has already been mentioned that Tertullian had some affinity for Stoic thought and this is evident in a section found in *De Anima*. Here Tertullian praises the fact that "The Stoics affirm that even the arts too have corporality; since at any rate the soul too must have corporality, since it is commonly supposed to be nourished by the arts." It would seem that Tertullian fundamentally agrees with the Stoic category of 'Body' since the arts, and also the soul, are ascribed corporality on the basis that they are existing things, thus affirming the Stoic pairing of ontology with corporeality. Tertullian, "A Treatise on The Soul," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. III*, trans. by Peter Holmes (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 187; Tertullian, *De Anima* VI. vii (CCSL II, 789).

[153] As Mattingly explains, "They [Stoics] boldly rejected the axiom that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time." It is at least possible, considering Tertullian's affirmation of Stoic ontology, that he too rejected this axiom. J.R. Mattingly, "Early Stoicism and The Problem of Its Systematic Form," 277.

passive or temporary state.[154] Both Stead and T.H. Irwin notably stand in opposition to this conclusion and instead argue for an immutable interpretation of the Stoic category of 'unqualified matter' (Gk. ἄποιος ὕλη).[155] In Irwin's case, he considers 'matter' to be in a type of dialectic where, on the one hand, Stoicism viewed 'matter' as perishing and consistently changing. In this view, whenever matter changes, the subject itself ceases to exist, and thus a new subject is born.[156] However, on the other hand, unqualified matter presented the idea that even amidst change, the matter was nevertheless persisting, able to last beyond the existence of a specific subject; however, the application of this interpretation in Stoic thought remains highly ambiguous.[157] At the very least, the immutable, 'unqualified matter' of the universe was almost exclusively intended for the universal, active principle which flowed through all things. The change ascribed to the universe was interpreted as the bodies of the universe returning to the active substance of the *τὶ*.

Critics of Stoicism in Antiquity found this system to be unnecessarily complicated, and fundamentally self-contradictory. As the Alexandrian philosopher, Plotinus, once derided, "Many as are the objections to this theory, we pass on for fear of ridicule we might incur by arguing against a position itself so manifestly ridiculous."[158] Nevertheless, there remains one

---

[154] Stead follows this same conclusion and remarks, "It was therefore easy for Platonist critics to represent Stoics as teaching that material substance accepts every form of change and has no continuity at all." This idea would have offended Platonist thinkers since, their system fundamentally recognized a universal, and most importantly, an immutable form that identified some aspect of a particular. Vid. Stead, *Divine Substance*, 123.

[155] T.H. Irwin, "Stoic Individuals," *Philosophical Perspectives* 10 (1996), 460, accessed January 15, 2020, doi: 10.2307/2216257. Cf. Stead, notably points out that some thinkers frequently replace ὕλη with οὐσία. Vid. Stead, *Divine Substance*, 121.

[156] Ibid., 462. Cf. Philo, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, Lib. IX.

[157] T.H. Irwin's article is insightful into a very complex issue concerning Stoic ontology; nevertheless, for the latter idea, he never establishes a consensus among the ancient Stoic sources, making it difficult to affirm his conclusions beyond a couple of individual thinkers.

[158] Plotinus, *The Six Enneads*, trans. by Stephen MacKenna and B. S. Page (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952), 267. For the Greek text, vid. "Ennead VI," in *Plotinus Vol. VI*, LCL, 100.

crucial aspect of Stoicism, which made it quite popular among thinkers in antiquity, and no doubt provided somewhat of a foundation for Tertullian's affinity towards Stoicism.

Stoic cosmology, i.e., a universe permeated by a unifying substance, identified as an active, rational spirit, allows for a significant proposition: that all of reality was controlled and propelled by 'fate' or 'providence.' Stoics argued that if the active principle of the universe is a spirit, then all that 'passively' manifests itself lends its ontology to this active principle.[159] Therefore, all of creation has meaning, and considerably more so humanity due to its unique relationship with this spirit. Unlike other living things, Stoics believed that humanity was endowed with unique qualities, sometimes defined as 'impulse' (Gk. *ὁρμή*), which they believed were bestowed by fate.[160] Recall for a moment, the notion in Stoicism that even abstract qualities were said to exist and possess *σωμάτον*.[161] In the relationship between fate and those abstract qualities found in a given body, it was fate that initiated those qualities, but their exercising was nevertheless the effect of the *σωμάτον* of a given thing. Scholar Margaret Reesor explains this via the analogy of 'intelligence.' She notes, "In the case of a quality such as intelligence, however, although intelligence exists in the substratum 'man' according to fate, the exercise of intelligence is within the power of man himself."[162] Thus, it was at least conceptually possible in Stoicism to believe in the unity of bodies in relation to the universal spirit, while simultaneously maintaining the significance of individual actions in carrying out that will.

---

[159] Susanne Bobzien identifies this relationship between the ontology of the active and passive principle as a type of "causal determinism" in which the causal chain between one body to another finds its source in the active principle as the first cause. Susanne Bobzien, "Early Stoic Determinism," *Revue De Métaphysique Et De Morale*, no. 4 (2005): 491, accessed May 10, 2019. www.jstor.org/stable/40904101.

[160] Marcus Aurelius echoed this when he wrote, "Πάντα ἐκεῖθεν ἔρχεται, ἀπ᾽ἐκείνου τοῦ κοινοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ ὁρμήσαντα ἢ κατ᾽ἐπακολούθησιν." Marcus Aurelius, "Meditations VI," in *Marcus Aurelius*, ed. by C. R. Haines, LCL, 1651.

[161] See pages 35-6.

[162] Margaret E. Reesor, "Fate and Possibility in Early Stoic Philosophy," *Phoenix* 19, no.4 (1965): 289, accessed December 18, 2019, doi:10.2307/1085828.

In summary, the philosophical history of *substantia* is complex; however, in reviewing the sources and looking at its application in Peripatetic and Stoic contexts, it is clear that *substantia* took a pivotal, however diverse, role in the understanding of ontology. In particular, it designated the individual as *πρώτη οὐσία* in Aristotelian thought, and also referred to the unity of qualities as part of the universal spirit in Stoicism. Stoicism, uniquely, provided within its system of ontological corporeality, the possibility for coexisting bodies in one body. With this in mind, our discussion can now return to the main subject, Tertullian, and how he applied the term *substantia* in his writings.

II: Substantia in Tertullian

Without question, if there is one point of consensus among scholars on Tertullian, it is this: Tertullian applied *substantia* with as much lexical liberty as his philosophical predecessors, if not more so. Moreover, when perusing the corpus of his texts, it is apparent that *substantia* serves as the linchpin of several significant works, adding weight to its rendering in modern translations. Nevertheless, translators of Tertullian can simply choose to render the term 'substance,' potentially hindering an argument's intelligibility or a foundational idea.[163] Therefore, the following section will analyze and categorize varied lexical renderings to better understand the application of *substantia* by Tertullian, specifically in the context of divinity.

II.1: The Rhetorical Applications of Substantia:

The first lexical category of *substantia* is the rhetorical category. For example, *substantia* can be rendered in the legal sense as 'property,' especially the sense of 'that which is held in

[163] Peter Kitzler's critique of this repeated rendering of *substantia* as 'substance' remains valid. For, as he quipped, "the meaning of what Tertullian tries to say can at times even become incomprehensible, if a translator or interpreter does not venture to find another equivalent or at least to sketch the appropriate context." Vid. Peter Kitzler, "Tertullian's Use of 'Substantia' In 'De Carne Christi,'" *Hermes* 142, no. 4 (2014), 506. In praise of Alexander Robert's translation, he notably is flexible with his renderings. For example: "They call him indeed, as to his essence [*substantia*]…" Cf. Tertullian, "Against the Valentinians," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. III*, translated by Alexander Roberts (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 506.

common,'[164] and to invoke the sense of the Greek *ὑπόστασις*, which rhetorically can denote the "subject matter" or the "confidence" of a passage.[165] Another example was highlighted by Peter Kitzler, in *De Carne Christi*. He notes that in one instance, "*substantia* represents the 'matter,' though it is used rather rhetorically as a periphrasis for *nulla materia* (= *ex nihilo*)."[166] Thus, renderings that are abstract or in which the term is invoked as a rhetorical device, are allocated to this category.

II.2: The Material Application of Substantia: A Potential Misnomer

Some have found that in specific cases, *substantia* can be synonymous with *materia*, i.e., it can be rendered 'matter' or the 'essential' material through which a thing is composed. This rendering primarily appears with interpretations of Christ's terrestrial body deemed heretical by Tertullian. [167] In one example, Tertullian wrote, "Non tamen ad materiae differentiam spectat, sed tantum terrenae retro substantiae carn is primi hominis, id est adae, celeste de spiritu substantiam opponit secondi hominis, id est Christi."[168] From this citation, both Kitzler and Stead have suggested that Tertullian utilized *substantia* in this sense to invoke a "constituent element" to the Godhead, explicitly identifying the spirit as the constituent element of the divine substance.[169] This interpretation bears some credence in light of Tertullian's Stoic affinities, whereas through such a lens, one might consider the question,"quis enim negabit deum corpus

---

[164] Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1948), 43.
Cf. Tertullian, *Apologia* XXXIX. x (CCSL I, 151); *De Cultu Fem.* Lib. I., Cap. IX. iii (CCSL I, 352).
[165] Ibid.,. Cf. Tertullian, *De Cultu Fem.* Lib. II., Cap. II. ii (CCSL I, 354); *Adversus Praxean* XXV. I (CCSL II, 1195); XXXI. i (CCSL II, 1203).
[166] Peter Kitzler, "Tertullian's Use of 'Substantia' In 'De Carne Christi,'" 509. Cf. Tertullian, *De Carne Christi* VI. ii (CCSL II, 883).
[167] Ibid., 508.
[168] Cf. Tertullian, *De Carne Christi* VIII (CCSL II, 890-1).
[169] Vid. Peter Kitzler, "Tertullian's Use of 'Substantia' In 'De Carne Christi,'" 508. Christopher Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian," *JTS* 14, no. 1 (1963), 63. There is something though to the fact that Christ's divine substance is associated with the Spirit; however, this association is more ontological than material.

esse, etsi deus spiritus est?,"[170] and argue that Tertullian, as a Stoic thinker, is ascribing a sense of 'material' constituency to the divine substance.[171]

If this were the case, then one would expect *substantia* and *materia* to appear as parallel realities, and notably, they do not. In fact, in a text such as *Adversus Hermogenem*, where Hermogenes was said to ascribe a coeternal *materia* by which God created the world in *Genesis*, Tertullian consistently contrasts the two terms as oppositional realities. Both Tertullian and Hermogenes ascribed attributes to God, such as simplicity, unicity, and eternality, yet Hermogenes, unlike Tertullian, "applied these same qualities to matter."[172] It would seem that Tertullian, who later objects to divine qualities being attributed to *materia*, instead prefers to associate *substantia* with the unique attributes of God, and therefore *substantia* can only be ascribed to God. In one instance, he explains, "Non potest dicere deum ut dominum materia usum ad opera mundi; dominus enim non potuit esse substantiae coaequalis."[173] Moreover, in the same section, he expounds, "cum ex dominio defendit deum materia usum, et de re non sua, scilet non facta ab ipso."[174] In the first quotation, the point of the shift from *materia* to *substantia* is clear: those things which are the immutable qualities ascribed to God are not *possessed* as 'matter' but *are* 'substance.'[175]

---

[170] Latin text, vid. Ernest Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 96. Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. viii (CCSL II, 1166).

[171] There is some attractiveness to this position in that Tertullian did agree with the Stoic pairing of ontology with corporeality, as is seen from *De Anima*. For a brief consideration of this passage, consider note 32 on page 9.

[172] Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem* VI. i (CCSL I, 401).

[173] Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem* IX. i (CCSL I, 404).

[174] Ibid., IX. ii (CCSL I, 404).

[175] Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem* XXXV. ii; XXXVI. iii-iv (CCSL I, 427-8). Stead fails to identify this qualitative distinction between *substantia* and *materia*, as is clear by his assessment that, "*Substantia* may be used in a general or a collective sense for the stuff of which all things are composed." The point is not that God forms the world out of another *substantia*, nor out of a pre-existing *materia*. The world is formed of *materia* but *ex nihilo*. *Substantia*, in that it is an ontological reality in its association to God, precludes any association with matter. This concept is one way that Tertullian, who is willing to accept certain Stoic beliefs, nevertheless is not a Stoic thinker in the traditional sense. Vid. Christopher Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian," 59.

In the second quotation, *substantia* is absent; instead, the oppositional phrase to "materia usum" is "re non sua." Lexically, it is possible to translate *res* as 'matter' or 'stuff;' however, given the first quotation, that would contradict Tertullian's established distinction,[176] not to mention similar synonymy in other texts.[177] Thus, in cases where *substantia* can stand in for *materia*, these almost exclusively appear in quotations concerning Tertullian's opponents' beliefs. The reality that Tertullian understood *substantia* as other than *materia*,[178] lends credence to the more philosophical application of *substantia*, expounded in the previous section, specifically the ontological interpretations of the Peripatetic school.[179]

A second objection to this is that Tertullian does not believe that God possesses the spirit by constituency. In Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean*, the Spirit is both substance and person. There are instances where *substantia* can denote the 'nature' of a thing; however, this is highly

[176] I am deeply indebted to J. H. Wasink's translation of *Adversus Hermogenem*, in which he translates the phrase *re non sua* as "a substance that was not his," which first alluded me to identify the distinction being drawn in this passage by Tertullian. Lexically, *res* can mean 'substance' in the sense which Tertullian is using it. Holmes missed this in his translation and chose to translate instead, "of his having not made it." The flaw of this is aptly pointed out by Wasink, who argues this translation stemmed from the misidentification of materia, instead of the emphasis and parallel being on simply *usum*. Tertullian, *Treatise Against Hermogenes*, trans. by J. H. Wasink, ACW (New York: Newman Press, 1956), 38; Ibid., note 73 on page 119. Cf. Tertullian, "Against Hermogenes," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. III*, translated by Peter Holmes (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 482.

[177] One such example is *Adversus Praxean* VII, discussed on page 17.

[178] Another example of this distinction is evident in *De Anima* XI. i (CCSL II, 796), in which Tertullian repeats, "ceterum aduersus Hermogenen, qui eam ex materia, non ex dei flatu contendit, flatum proprie tuemur." And later, in Cap. XXXII, the soul, is said to be, by nature, immutable, a characteristic only ascribed to *substantia*.

[179] A common tendency, and a challenge for contemporary interpreters of Tertullian, is to either view Tertullian as a philosopher, specifically a Stoic, or view him as exclusively a theologian. An example of the latter position is the commonly recited dictum of Tertullian's, "Therefore, what has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" Tertullian, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* VII. ix (CCSL I, 193). Stead takes the former position, noticeably arguing for more 'material' interpretations of Tertullian's concepts, opting to view *corpus* as synonymous with *substantia*. Tertullian certainly had philosophical inclinations, but it is inaccurate to interpret him strictly along Stoic lines. No doubt, as in his relationship with the New Prophecy, Tertullian quite elastically applied terms and ideas whenever it suited his argument. This elasticity means that Tertullian could both, in one text praise Stoicism for one idea, and yet in another challenge the superiority of philosophy to the *regula fidei* of Christianity, without being inconsistent. Only when one acknowledges this can one make sense of such contradictory statements.

dependent upon the ontological reality denoted by the word.[180] This last point will be the primary focus of the following section.

II.3: The Ontological Applications of Substantia:

The ontological application of *substantia* by Tertullian arguably forms two primary ontological categories: *πρώτη οὐσία* and the *Economic*[181] application. Concerning the former, Evans, in the introduction to his translation and commentary of Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean*, presents what he considers to be the primary usage of *substantia*, which he argues is synonymous with the Aristotelian application of *οὐσία*. The conceptual validity of this claim is dependent upon whether Aristotle's theory of the categories could have made its way into Tertullian's philosophical compendium. It is clear from his references to the Stoa and the Academy that Tertullian was familiar with these schools of thought.[182] Furthermore, J.H. Wasink has aptly proven that Albinus, the Middle Platonist philosopher, appears to be a philosophical source in both *De Anima* and *Adversus Hermogenem*, which provides substantiality to Evans's link.[183] Internally, this application does appear consistent with Tertullian's reasoning, and Evans presents numerous examples of where he believes the term denotes *οὐσία*.

In the case of *De Anima*, Evans argues that Tertullian utilized *substantia* in the secondary sense, i.e., *δευτέραι οὐσίαι*. For example:

> Sed ut animam spiritum dica, praestentis quaestionis ratio compellit, quia spirare alii substantiae adscribitur. Hoc dum animae uindicamus, quam uniformem et simplicem agnoscimus, spiritum necesse est certa condicione dicamus, non status

[180] This application is consistent with Tertullian's use of *δευτέραι οὐσίαι*. This ontological category never frames the divine substance. For a discussion of this, vid. pages 44-45.
[181] The use of *Economy* here should not be confused with the Economy of Salvation. Economy, as Tertullian used it, expresses the eternal arrangement of Persons within the Godhead. Following Tertullian's usage, we shall apply the term in the same way, to denote the distinction of Persons within the Godhead as a complementary designation of divine unity. Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VIII. vii (CCSL II, 1167).
[182] Tertullian, *De Anima* VI-VII (CCSL II, 787-90).
[183] J.H. Waszink, "Observations on Tertullian's Treatise against Hermogenes," *VC* 9, no. 2 (1955): 138-41, accessed December 19, 2019, doi:10.2307/1582665.

> nomine, sed actus, nec substantiae titulo, sed operae, quia spirat, non quia spiritus proprie est. Nam et flare spirare est.[184]

In other words, the *substantia* of the soul is *spiritus*, not as an accident but as *opera* (Gk. *ποιεῖν*) since breath is in its nature.[185]

Specifically, in instances where the divine substance is the intended object, Evans argues that Tertullian used it to denote, not *δεύτερος οὐσία*, but *οὐσία πρώτη* since, "Substantia, it appears, though it might have meant 'existence,' comes in practice to mean an existent thing: and since God is not a species or genus, it must mean a *πρώτη οὐσία*, a single individual being."[186] Examples of this include Tertullian's treatment of the old and new person described by Paul in *Ephesians*,[187] in which Tertullian describes what he believes to be a fallacious interpretation of that passage. He explains, "ut et hic ad duas substantias distinguendo, uetustatem ad carnum, nouitatem ad animam, corruptionem perpetuam ueteri defendant, id est carni."[188] When one reads the following section in its entirety, Tertullian's objection to this distinction is clear, the 'newness' and 'oldness' is not a *substantial* distinction but rather a distinction of *character*.[189] To say that two substances existed in a human being would contradict the reality that a human is nonetheless an *individual* thing.[190]

Elsewhere in his rebuttal against the Valentinians, he describes their deity in their terms noting, "Hunc substantialiter quidem *Αἰῶνα Τέλιον* appellant, personaliter uero *Προπάτορα* et

---

[184] Tertullian, *De Anima* XI. i (CCSL II, 796).
[185] Another reference invoked by Evans is in *De Anima* XXXII (CCSL II, 829-32). Here Tertullian refutes metempsychosis since, as Evans explains, "a thing is what it is, and cannot be another thing." Vid. Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 40-41. Cf. Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* III. iii (CCSL I, 324).
[186] Ibid.,.
[187] *Ephesians* 4:17-24.
[188] Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* XLV. i (CCSL II, 981).
[189] As he later notes, "tam uetustatem hominis quam nouitatem ad morale, non ad substantialem, differentiam pertinere defendimus." *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* XLV. xv (CCSL II, 982).
[190] Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* XXVII. viii (CCSL II, 1197).

Προαρχήν, etiam Bython, quod in sublimibus habitanti minime congruebat."[191] Here Tertullian's employment of *substantia* denotes the *individual* deity,[192] which the Valentinians identified with proper names. Moreover, this application undoubtedly made his concluding quip about the proper name "Bythos" all the more potent.[193] As with the case of *substantia* in *Adversus Hermogemem*, Tertullian's repeated problem with heretical notions is that they construe substance with 'operations' or 'activities.' Evans articulated this point well:

> In every case, we seem to be dealing with the Aristotelian categories: certain persons wish to take *in principio* not in the category of *ποτέ* but of *οὐσία*: motion is not *οὐσία* but *ποιεῖν* or *πάσχειν*: faith and charity are not *οὐσία* but are activities of the understanding: the inner man is not *οὐσία* but *ποῖον*.[194]

In these references, it stands that the intended usage of *substantia* is *πρώτη οὐσία*. However, what remains to be shown is whether this interpretation is exclusively valid in regards to the divine substance, especially when Tertullian utilizes it to denote a specific Person of the Trinity.

Evans argued that *substantia*, in references to the Godhead and the Persons of the Trinity, denoted the unity of the persons as *una substantia*, i.e., as an "individual thing."[195] However, as we shall see, it can also stand that each person is fully divine in that he is both *substantia* and yet also *persona*.[196] A key passage for this idea is found in *Adversus Praxean* VII, in which

---

[191] Tertullian, *Adversus Valentinianos*, VII. iii (CCSL II, 758).
[192] The translation of Alexander Robert's has already been praised for its lucid translation of *substantia*, in which he agrees with Evans that, in this quotation, *substantia* is synonymous with the Greek *οὐσία*, which he denotes by translating the word as 'essence.' Cf. Tertullian, "Against the Valentinians," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. III*, translated by Alexander Roberts, 506.
[193] Other references invoked by Evans, though not treated here are as follows: *Adversus Valentinianos* XXVII (CCSL II, 773); *Adversus Hermogenem* VII (CCSL I, 402-3); Ibid., XXXVI (CCSL I, 427); *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* XL (CCSL II, 968-9).
[194] Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 42. Stead provides a very similar list, with examples in "Divine Substance in Tertullian," 56.
[195] It should not go unnoticed that the first use of *substantia* in the *Adversus Praxean* is in reference to all three persons of the Trinity. Vid. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* II. iv (CCSL II, 1161).
[196] For brevity's sake, Tertullian's use of *persona* will not be discussed here since it has been treated sufficiently by Evans, and there is little value to expounding beyond his exposition. Nevertheless, let us indicate one significant point of his. He wrote that theologically, "a person is that particular kind of *res* which is conscious of itself, of its own existence and relationships." This definition is important to recognize because while more philosophical or

Tertullian explains that *Sermo* is not merely an *operation* of the Father, but is *substantively* begotten, and manifested in the divine act of creation, wherein he is a distinct *persona*. He wrote,

> Non uis enim eum substantiuum habere in re per substantiae proprietatem, ut res et persona quaedam uideri possit et ita capiat secundus a Deo constitutus duos efficere, Patrem et Filium, Deum et Sermonem. Quid est enim, dices, sermo nisi uox et sonus oris et, sicut grammatici tradunt, aer offensus intelligilis auditu, ceterum uacuum nescio quid et inane et incorporeal?[197]

When Tertullian composed the phrase, "ut res et persona quaedam uideri possit," it is clear that he intended to emphasize both the unifying and distinctive usage of *substantia*, as representative of the *una et tres*. This is not to say that he is then suggesting there are three substances. The ontological emphasis is nonetheless on *una substantia*—i.e., an individual being.[198] Nevertheless, he does balance two significant ideas: on the one hand, he rejects the notion that the Father alone is *substantia*, and the Son and Spirit are not *substantia*.[199] As he articulates

---

psychological renderings have been offered and suggested, in most instances, this theological usage is what Tertullian intends. Vid. Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 47.

[197] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII.v-vi (CCSL II, 1166).

[198] Admittedly, Tertullian at times gets a little overzealous with nature analogies. In his affirmation that *Sermo* is "another," he uses common analogies from nature (i.e., root and its shoots, water which flows from a spring, and so forth) to declare the relational distinction between Father and Son as *una et alius*. As he explains, "Pater enim tota substantia est, filius uero deriutatio totius et portio sicut ipse profitetur: *Quia Pater maior me est*… Sic et Pater alius a Filio maior, dum alius qui mittit, alius qui generat, dum alius qui mitti, alius qui mittitur, dum alius qui facit, alius per quem fit." Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* IX. ii (CCSL II, 1168). Evans believes *portio* in the text does mean "part," thereby denoting a type of "minoration" not only in the humanity of the Son but also in his divinity. Several scholars have noted such subordinationist tendencies; however, such subordination manifests in Tertullian's thoughts, not in substance but in operation and extension. Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 44.

[199] While this may seem obvious to theologians today, at the time of Tertullian, this was a challenging proposition to communicate, as is attested by Tertullian's Alexandrian contemporary, Origen. In Origen's case, he erred close, if not fully, into a form of ditheism, where both the Father and the Son are claimed to be distinct "Gods," yet are one in power [Tertullian objects to this language in *Adversus Praxean* XIII. vi (CCSL II, 1175)]. Origen's response to Sabellianism reveals just how easy it was to commit a theological over-correction when defending the divine economy. He recognized that the Son is fully divine, but he was unable to comprehend how that related to the Father's divinity in a real *substantive* sense without agreeing with the Sabellians. It is perhaps for this reason that he chose instead *ὑπόστασις* as the preferred term for Trinitarian discourse. Nevertheless, Tertullian's rationale provided the language that Origen so desperately needed to defend the divine unity and economy adequately. Vid. Origen, *Treatise on The Passover and Dialogue with Heraclides*, trans. by Robert Daly, ACW (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), 57-59. Cf. Origen's exposition on the relation between the Father and the Son in *On First Principles*, trans. by G. W. Butterworth (Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 2013), 21-37; For a larger discussion on Origen's Trinitarian theology, and his preference for *ὑπόστασις*, Vid. Lewis Ayres, "Points of Departure," in *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 11-40.

elsewhere, "tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis quia…"[200] On the other hand, Tertullian also states that the "substantiae proprietatem" reveals not only "in re," i.e., actual existence, but also *persona*. Thus, he is unwilling to conclude that the Son, who is *substantia*, is then viz. an identical person to the Father.[201] This second proposition seemingly refutes Evan's ubiquitous categorical identification of *substantia* with *πρώτη οὐσία*,[202] especially when one considers that Tertullian's distinction between *substantia* and *persona*, does not have a grounding in Aristotle's *Categories*, in which such a distinction is never formulated.[203]

This point is further illustrated by Stead, who argued that interpreting *substantia* as 'an individual thing' in genitive pairings such as *substantia Dei*,[204] *Patris*,[205] or *Sermis*,[206] contradicts Tertullian's rational.[207] To affirm that *substantia Dei* and *substantia Patris* both mean an 'individual thing,' would preclude any personal distinction between the Father and the Son. Instead, Stead offered an economic solution that is worth noting. He explained,

---

[200] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* II. iv (CCSL II, 1161).
[201] Notice the use of *person* in this case. While I agree with Stead fundamentally that Tertullian does not want to espouse that the Father and the Son are identical [as Tertullian clearly objects to this in multiple places: *Adversus Praxean* V. i (CCSL II,1163); VII. ix (CCSL II, 1167); IX. i-iii (CCSL II, 1168)], he freely posits, perhaps unconsciously, the term "being" as a distinction between Father and Son. The use of "being" concerning the distinction of persons is inappropriate since it negates Tertullian's belief that God is one *being* with three distinct persons ontologically. Even if Tertullian acknowledged a quasi-ontological distinction between each person, the predicated assumption was in *una substantia*—i.e., a real *individual* being. Vid. Christopher Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian," 53.
[202] Evan's point that *substantia* is primarily an ontological term used to denote *πρώτη οὐσία* does stand in several instances. Cf. *Adversus Marcionem* III. vi (CCSL I, 514-7); *Adversus Praxean* V (CCSL II, 1163-4). The point that the author is unwilling to concede is that *substantia* exclusively means *πρώτη οὐσία* when used to reference each Person within the divine economy.
[203] Stead makes this same critique of Evans's evaluation, pointing towards Aristotle's qualifier of "ὁ τὶς ἄνθρωπος ἢ ὁ τὶς ἵππος" as removing any real distinction of ontology and person. Christopher Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian," 50. Cf. Page 32.
[204] Tertullian, *Adversus Paxean* VII. ix (CCSL II, 1167); XXVI. vi (CCSL II, 1196-7).
[205] Ibid., III. v; IV. i (CCSL II, 1162).
[206] Ibid., VII. ix (CCSL II, 1167); XXVI. iv (CCSL II, 1196-7).
[207] Stead explained, "Tertullian is clearly not referring to an individual thing distinct from the Father; so presumably in these passages *substantia* does not mean 'an individual thing.' Vid. Christopher Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian," 50.

> We can justify the statement if we say that *substantia* means something like the 'content' or the 'whole *inner* reality'; for this allows us to reserve such features as the outward aspect, the Name, and perhaps 'whatever the Name necessarily implies,' as the ground of personal distinctions in the Trinity.[208]

Stead's reasoning allows for economic interpretations that emphasize the personal nature of *substantia*, at the very least in such genitive pairings where a specific person of the Trinity is identified.

There are then several options when espousing a personal definition for *substantia*. One option is to remain within the Aristotelian categories and assert that *substantia* here means the same thing as *δεύτερος οὐσία*. Considering that Tertullian never uses *substantia* to denote any sort of genus or species of divinity, this option should be disregarded altogether. Another possibility, and indeed, a more attractive option, is that *substantia* also denotes the "content" or "the constituent element" of divinity. The weakness of this position lies in the fact that according to Tertullian, God does not possess attributes nor divinity *as* substance, but simply *is* substance. Therefore, this overly-materialistic definition does not render adequately the ontological and personal renderings which *substantia* provided.[209] A third and more probable definition originates in Tertullian's affirmation of the Stoic ontological category denoted by 'body,'[210] and considering that this category functioned uniquely to represent both ontological individuation or

---

[208] Ibid., 53. cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. ix (CCSL II, 1167).

[209] Even though Stead adamantly contends that Tertullian application of *corpus* and *spiritus* included a spatial reality, though there is little evidence to support this claim. The closest we come to this idea is in the statement, "in quo omnis, non ipse in loco, qui universtatis extrema linea est…" which can either be interpreted, as Stead argues, that God lives outside of outer space or, that God because he holds the world together, established the boundary of the universe. The latter seems more likely considering the precluding statement of Tertullian's, "qui totum orbem manu adprehendit velut nidum…" Stead's only other defense is an argument from silence: since Tertullian does not explicitly reject God's spatial dwelling, he could have believed it. The weakness of this form of argument goes without saying. Vid. Christopher Stead, "God's Substance in Theological Tradition," in *Divine Substance*, 179. Cf. *Adversus Praxean* XVI.vi (CCSL II, 1181-2).

[210] Tertullian, *De Anima* VI. vii-viii (CCSL II, 789). cf. *Adversus Hermogenem* XXXV (CCSL I, 427).

pluralization in Stoicism, this is perhaps the most attractive option for solving the present lexical dilemma.

Before we proceed in our final analysis of the divine spirit,[211] as both Substance and Person, may we surmise a subtle intention of Tertullian's application of *substantia*. Peter Kitzler hypothesized that Tertullian was drawn to *substantia* because of its "emptiness" which meant it could be "filled with so many meanings."[212] A fair assessment, undoubtedly, because it recognizes the elasticity of the term in Tertullian. However, we may also consider another purpose as to why Tertullian was drawn to *substantia*. *Substantia* uniquely could be applied to establish a boundary of thought rather than a description of being. Because of its philosophical application, it established a pre-existing boundary for ontological reflection. A reader may be inclined to assert *substantia* as *πρώτη οὐσία*; however, in this ascription, there exists a natural rejection of other categories of ontology. As we have shown, in certain instances, *substantia* could not exclusively denote *πρώτη οὐσία*. Since the boundary of thought was already established, i.e., God is an individual being, any other economic renderings must derive itself from the first.

When Tertullian first reflected on the second Person, *Sermo*, he provides as evidence several nature analogies, which reveal extension and distinction, thereby excluding any concept of division.[213] He proclaimed that the Father and Son are one and another; however, we simply know this as declaration, not explanation.[214] This statement is not to say that he does not provide

---

[211] For the remainder of our discussion, I will be Capitalizing Spirit when referring to the Third Person, The Holy Spirit, rather than the divine spirit, the divine substance which is spirit. This will help facilitate a distinction between Person and Substance which Tertullian established and which we also desire to maintain in our discussion.
[212] Peter Kitzler, "Tertullian's Use of 'Substantia' In 'De Carne Christi,'" 510.
[213] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VIII (CCSL II, 1167-8).
[214] Evans was close to this idea when he wrote, "There are two and even three who are called God and Lord, though there are not three gods or three lords: on this set of facts, not on any explanation of them, Tertullian rests." Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 45.

various proofs; however, beyond declaration, we are left befuddled as to how *substantia* is both substance and person in any real descriptive sense.[215] This consideration provides a particular stepping point to the primary purpose of our study: whether Tertullian appropriated to the Holy Spirit an operation that naturally drew upon the close association of substance with spirit.

III: Spiritus: Substantia et Persona

It is unfortunate that *Adversus Praxean* remains today an incomplete text. As with other theological writings of the second and third centuries, Tertullian places heavy emphasis on the second Person—*Sermo*.[216] One may surmise whether he intended to discuss the Holy Spirit in the completed text; however, the end of such speculation is trivial, since Adversus Praxean is permeated by the Holy Spirit's presence, making it a genuinely Trinitarian text. The Pneumatic centrality[217] manifests itself in quotations where Tertullian explicitly connects the divine substance with the Holy Spirit, and where he develops an exegetical framework, deeply rooted in the Holy Spirit's revelatory operation in prophetic utterance. The latter application would serve as the foundation for Tertullian's epistemological sequence, where the Holy Spirit indwells the Church and thus uniquely functions as the communicator of the Trinity. Let us first finish the

---

[215] Another famous North African theologian, Augustine of Hippo, likewise considered *substantia* a term of designation rather than description. In his reflection on the Trinity a century later, he wrote, "And the reason there are said to be three persons or three substances is not to signify any diversity of being, but to have at least one word to answer when asked three what or three who." Augustine, *The Trinity*, trans. by Edmund Hill (Hyde Park: New City Press, 2015), 241.

[216] This statement is not a critique of Tertullian's or any of the Christian writers of the second and third centuries. Any argument employed to defend the divinity of the Son could easily apply to the divinity of the Third. Further, an emphasis on the distinction between the Father and Son precluded any form of patripassionism. As Jaroslav Pelikan reflects, "This effort to clarify the relationship between Christ and God seems to have foundered at the very place where its bête noire, the pluralistic speculation of Marcion and the Gnostics, did: the crucifixion and death of the one called God." Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine Vol. 1* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971), 180.

[217] The close association of spirit to divinity by Tertullian is nothing novel in the Christian theological tradition. Among New Testament writers, *John* 4:24 stated that "God is spirit," and the ascriptions of *spiritus Dei*, *spiritus Christi*, as well as the affirmation of the indwelling of the *Sacra Spiritus*, frequently appear in Pauline Epistles (Ex. *Romans* 8:9; *1 Cor.* 3:16-17; 6:19). Rash associations of Spirit with Stoic pneumatology and cosmology fail to adequately recognize the rich theological tradition which Tertullian undoubtedly drew upon in his reflections.

discussion of the previous section and seek to understand the connection between substance and spirit.

III.1: Spiritus as Substantia: An Onto-Economic Designation:

Shortly following Tertullian's declaration that the Three Persons are unified by one substance, Tertullian explains that "Quis enim negabit deum corpus esse, etsi deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie."[218] Recollecting Stoic corporeality, it is clear that any ascription of divine corporeality by Tertullian simply affirmed the realness of God's realness. Like *substantia*, *corpus* can be applied to denote the existence of the singular and the collective.[219] As Tertullian explains elsewhere, "Quis enim scit quae sint in Deo nisi Spiritus qui in ipso est? Sermo autem Spiritu structus est et, ut ita dixerim, sermonis corpus est Spiritus..."[220] The parallel between *substantia* and *corpus* is clear in this instance, for just as the Trinity is unified in the divine substance, they are also unified in one body. Likewise, just as the substance of *Sermo* reveals Person, and so too, the body of *Sermo* reveals Person.[221]

This ontological parallel further exists where Tertullian directly invokes *spiritus* in connection with the divine substance. In *De Carne Christi*, Tertullian describes Christ's divine substance as "de spiritu substantiam."[222] Elsewhere in Tertullian, the unity of substance between the Father and Son is defended in creedal declaration. "Et idcirco filium Dei," reasoned Tertullian, "et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiae: nam et Deus spiritus…Ita de spiritu spiritus

---

[218] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. viii (CCSL II, 1166-7).
[219] There is precedent rooted in Stoicism for multiple 'bodies' existing in one body. Stoics believed that the ontology of these bodies was related, yet also distinct from the main body's ontology. This concept is not unlike the unifying, and economic applications of *Substantia* noted previously. For a discussion of Stoic bodies, vid. pages 35-6.
[220] Vid. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VIII. iv (CCSL II, 1167).
[221] A beneficial exercise for revealing this ontological synonymy is to replace instances of *substantia* with *corpus*. If they are identical or similar in usage, one would expect a passage like: "nec carere substantia quod de tanta substantia processit et tantas substantia fecit," to read the same, or at least carry the same ontological usage when replaced by the word *corpus*. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. vi (CCSL II, 1166). Cf. Christopher Stead, "Divine Substance in Tertullian," 64.
[222] Cf. Tertullian, *De Carne Christi* VIII (CCSL II, 890-1).

et de Deo Deus…"[223] As previously stated, the Son is eternally generated by the Father as substance and spirit. Because Father and Son are both substance and thereby Spirit, Tertullian could then take a passage, such as *Luke* 1:35, as proof of the Son's divinity—i.e. the Son participated in the unity of operations because he was divine. However, Holy Spirit's presence in this passage necessitates a brief qualification on how Tertullian understood the relationship between the Son as divine Spirit and the procession of the Third Person—the Holy Spirit.

One scholarly suggestion stems from a similarity between a slightly older theologian, Irenaeus,[224] specifically his 'Spirit-Christology' and Tertullian's exposition of the Son as 'spirit.' In this interpretation, Tertullian's use of *spiritus* denotes the pre-incarnate Son, the unclothed *Sermo*.[225] There are several reasons to reject this interpretation, especially when considering a parallel passage in *Adversus Praxean*. Here Tertullian repeats the same point explaining,

> Et aliter tamen in isto capitulo reuincentur. "Ecce, inquiunt, ab angelo praedicatum est: *Propterea quod nascetur sanctum uocabitur Filius Dei*. Caro itaque nata est, caro itaque erit Filius Dei." Immo de spiritu Dei dictum est. Certe enim de Spiritu sancto uirgo concepit et quod concepit, id peperit. Id ergo nasci habebat, quod erat conceptum et pariundum, id est spiritus, cuius et *uocabitur nomen Emmanuel*, *quod est interpretatum: nobiscum Deus*.[226]

Notably, even though the *spiritus* which descends upon Mary is the pre-clothed *Sermo*, it is clear here that Tertullian is not equating the 'pre-clothed *Sermo*' with the Holy Spirit. We may infer that in Tertullian's understanding, the descension of the Holy Spirit is the descension of the

---

[223] Tertullian, *Apologeticum* XXI. xi-xii (CCSL I, 124).
[224] This discussion is relevant considering Irenaeus was a primary source in Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*. It would make sense if Irenaeus's Christology influenced Tertullian's Christology. Vid., Timothy barnes, Timothy Barnes, *A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 327.
[225] The similarity between these two thinkers is their ascription of Spirit to the divinity of the Son. Some scholars argue that the Holy Spirit, in both writers, is simply the unclothed Word of God. As will be shown, this is not only incorrect for Irenaeus but also for Tertullian. For a discussion of different scholarly perspectives and a refutation of this interpretation in Irenaeus, vid. Anthony Briggman, "Spirit-Christology in Irenaeus: A Closer Look," *VC 66*, No.1 (2012):1-19, accessed April 20, 2020. https://www-jstor-org.dtl.idm.oclc.org/stable/41480513. Consider also Irenaeus's ascription of πνεῦμα to the divinity of Christ in Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. I*, trans. by W. H. Rambaut, 527.
[226] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* XXVII. iv-v (CCSL II, 1198). cf. *Apologeticum* XXI (CCSL I, 122-8).

divine spirit, whereby the wholeness of divinity is understood to have descended—i.e., the divine substance.[227] Evans further explained this conclusion, writing, "*Spirit* is not a function of the divine substance: it is *the* divine substance: the divine substance which is *spirit*."[228] While Evans's explanation correctly recognizes the intent of Tertullian, what it does not do is explain how Tertullian recognized the divine substance in the personal designation of the Holy Spirit in Luke's gospel. It would appear that within Tertullian's reading there is something distinct in the designation of the Third Person which lends itself to the revelation and presence of the First and Second Persons.

The solution to this rests in how Tertullian recognized the relationship between the Son and the Third Person. The divine Spirit, while it is the form of both the divine *substantia* and *corpus*, therefore designating the distinction and yet unity of the Three, it is also that which proceeds from the Father in the eternal generation of the Son and also the procession of the Holy Spirit. We have already seen that *spiritus* can denote the Father, Son, or the Holy Spirit, but it can also denote the Trinity. Moreover, with regards to the latter, in Tertullian's consideration, there was something intuitive in the procession of the Third that provided the distinct operation of divine self-revelation to the Holy Spirit. As will be discussed in the following section, *Spiritus*, regarding the Third Person, denoted a form of divine self-revelation which established

---

[227] At the risk of being redundant, this should not be confused with any sort of 'materialistic' or a 'spatial' descension. Decades following Tertullian, another Western writer, Novatian, rejected the notion that Spirit was a type of substantive constituency precisely because it made God a creature (*Treatise Concerning the Trinity* VII); however, he did maintain that God was a Spirit (*Treatise Concerning the Trinity* V), though only ontologically as his essential being. Thus, Novatian, rather than speaking against Tertullian in this case, precludes such a constituent interpretation of his predecessor. For an accessible translation of these passages, vid. Novatian, "A Treatise on The Trinity," in *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. V*, trans. by Robert Ernest Wallis (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012), 615-17.

[228] Italic added for emphasis. Ernest Evans, Introduction to *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 43.

the foundation for which Tertullian understood the doctrine of Divine Indwelling within the Church.

III.2: The Operation of The Spirit as Trinitarian Communication:

What is presently under consideration is the nature of *Spiritus* as communicator of higher knowledge and divine self-revelation. In Tertullian's writings, there is an epistemological sequence that finds its origin in the divine spirit and the Holy Spirit's presence in the Son, who is present within the Father. The reasoning of Tertullian can be best explained like this: The person, *Spiritus*, finds his procession from both the Father and the Son,[229] but he is uniquely attached to the inner reason (Lat. *Ratio*) of the second person of the Trinity—*Sermo*.

In Tertullian's discourse on the procession of Sermo, it is clear that he considers the relationship between the Son and Spirit to be deeply intertwined. In the procession of the Son from the Father, Sermo is said to be "always within the Father,"[230] which is only possible because the Father and the Son share the same divine spirit. Tertullian then has no problem attaching the divine spirit with the substance of the Son, which he describes as "sermonem, spiritu et sophia, et ratione."[231] The three—spirit, wisdom, and reason—are present in *Sermo*, which Tertullian understands as being equally present within the Father under the name Wisdom. The oft-quoted prophetic passage, *Proverbs* 8, served as a foundation for this idea, in which Tertullian took this text to denote the generation of God's *ratio* as being eternally present but not manifested until the day of creation.[232]

---

[229] Tertullian believed in the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son, which is generally historically regarded as the 'filioque.' Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* IV. I (CCSL II, 1162).
[230] "Sermo ergo et in Patre semper…" Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. v (CCSL II, 1166).
[231] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII (CCSL II, 1165-6).
[232] Evans was right when he concluded that, "Tertullian is somewhat carried away by his argument: to say that Wisdom was *condita et generate* within God is to say that God was originally ἄλογος, which he certainly cannot have intended to say…this primary generation as a generation not of Wisdom itself but of the projected world *in dei sensu*, so anxious is he to maintain that Wisdom itself is coeternal with God." Tertullian may have been carried away by his reasoning; however, it is important to note that in his exegesis, he appears to have understood the

Furthermore, Sermo, who derives the above proper attributes from the Father, has present within him, as properly divine spirit, the Holy Spirit, who likewise derives his attributes from the Sermo. Tertullian explains the following proposition:

> *Sermone eius caeli confirmati sunt et spiritu eius omnes uires eorum*, utique eo Spiritus qui sermoni inerat, apparet unam eandemque uim esse nunc in nomine sophiae nunc in appellatione sermonis, quae initium accepit uiarum in Dei opera et quae caelum confirmauit, per quam omnia facta sunt et sine qua nihil factum est.[233]

Following this brief explanation, do we find Tertullian declaring the substance as the three: spirit, wisdom, and reason. By extension, since the Holy Spirit is also that divine Spirit, it was only natural for Tertullian to claim that the Third Person, also operates by the same divine reason. There are specific epistemological implications that we will set aside for the moment; instead, let us now consider the *ratio* of the Holy Spirit and how Tertullian believed that because *ratio* was in both Word and Spirit. Therefore, it manifested in the divine self-revelation of the Holy Spirit.

In true Trinitarian fashion, Tertullian believed that in the prophetic speech of the Hebrew Bible, specifically where two or more distinct Persons could be recognized, there was a particular order in which each Person's operation manifested in self-discourses. This interpretive practice, in contemporary scholarship, has been identified as 'prosopological exegesis,' which is simply an exegetical approach in the Early Church that interpreted the inner dialogue of the persons of the Trinity within Scripture.[234] Kyle Hughes argues that in Tertullian's exegesis of

---

personal, not substantive, distinction between the Father and *Sophia*, in the operation of the latter as *ad extra* of the Father. In other words, it was in the creative act that *Sophia*, as a divine *Persona*, manifested herself as the Second Person of the Trinity. Vid. Ernest Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The Text Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, 217. Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. i (CCSL II, 1165).

[233] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII. iii (CCSL II, 1166).

[234] Tertullian is not unique in this method. By the time of Tertullian, there was already an abundant use of this method in other Christian writers. For more in-depth analysis of the exegetical tradition, consider Matthew Bates, *The Birth of The Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of The Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 27-28.

specific passages, and the context of *Adversus Praxean* XI, Tertullian allows only for the Spirit to speak concerning the Father and the Son or all three. For example, in the exegesis of Ps. 110:1, Tertullian starts by concluding, "animadverte etiam spiritum loquentem ex tertia persona de patre et filio."[235] It would not be consistent with Tertullian's logic that the Father should call the Son, "Lord," and it makes little sense to assume that the Son would call himself Lord. Instead, it is most consistent with Tertullian's reasoning that it is the Holy Spirit who proclaims the Son to the Father. Hughes's analysis likewise reveals that Is. 45:1 and the pieced section composed of Is. 53:1, Jn. 12:38, Rom. 10:16, all follow the same flow of argument. Thus, Hughes explains, "When the Father or the Son Speaks, only those two Persons are in view, but when the Spirit speaks, all three persons are participating in the divine discourse."[236] This interpretation is further illustrated by the use of *Paraclete* to indicate the operation of divine self-revelation by the Holy Spirit.[237] Furthermore, if the evidence is still yet to be desired of the Holy Spirit's operation as Trinitarian communicator, consider Tertullian's concluding reflection of *Adversus Praxean*:

> Hic interim acceptum a Patre munus effudit, Spiritum sanctum, tertium nomen diuinitatis et tertium gradum maiestatis, unius praedicatorem monarchiae sed et oikonomiae interpretatorem, si quis sermons nouae prophetiae eius admiserit et deductorem omnis uertitatis quae est in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto secundum Christianum sacramentum.[238]

In such a quotation, two things remain ever clear. First, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, He reveals their relationship as Trinity. Secondly, Tertullian's association with the New Prophecy, though ethically driven, found its locus in the Triune operation of the

---

[235] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* XI. Vid. Tertullian, *Treatise Against Praxeas*, trans. by Ernest Evans, 100.
[236] Kyle Hughes, "The Spirit Speaks: Pneumatological Innovation in the Scriptural Exegesis of Justin and Tertullian," *VC* 69, No. 5 (2015): 468, accessed March 10, 2019, https://www.jstor.org/stable/24754534.
[237] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VIII. v (CCSL II, 1168-9); IX. iii (CCSL II, 1168-9).
[238] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* XXX. v (CCSL II, 1204).

Paraclete. This operation, as Tertullian considered it, manifested itself clearly in the escalated language of prophecy associated with the indwelling of the Holy Spirit by the New Prophecy.

Considering all that has been said up till now, it is possible to argue that from Tertullian's Trinitarian exposition, lay the seed of a common Trinitarian notion within Western Tradition that considered the Holy Spirit as that which both proceeds from and yet is that which unifies the First and Second Persons of the Trinity. Almost a century after Tertullian, another theologian of North Africa, Augustine of Hippo, developed his exposition on the Trinity. He wrote,

> That Holy Spirit whom we understand as being not the triad but in the triad, insofar as he is properly or peculiarly called the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son…perhaps he is given this name just because the same name can be applied to the Father and the Son. He is properly called what they are called in common, seeing that both Father and Son are holy and both Father and Son are spirit. So to signify the communion of them both by a name which applies to them both, the gift of both is called the Holy Spirit.[239]

In both Tertullian's and Augustine's expositions, this complimentary idea of union and distinction of the Holy Spirit exists. While Augustine preferred to emphasize the relational qualities of that union rather than the substantive qualities, there exists within his psychological analogies the fruit of the seed which Tertullian first planted. Thus, it would seem, that in Tertullian's relationship of substance and spirit, the seed was planted, and future theologians undoubtedly watered and produced fruit from that seed.

---

[239] From this idea, arose to the analogy of love, which Augustine famously articulated, "For there are three, the lover, and what is being loved, and love." The Holy Spirit, as the love which exists between the Lover and the Beloved, natural proceeds from the first and the second, and yet is the relational foundation for Lover and the Beloved. Vid. Augustine of Hippo, *De Trinitate* V. xii; IX. ii. For translation, vid. Augustine, *The Trinity*, trans. by Edmund Hill, 199; 272. Consider Edmund Hill's treatment of this idea of pneumatic union on pages, 268-9.

CHAPTER 3: DIVINE INDWELLING AND THE OPERATION OF THE SPIRIT

The preceding chapter concluded that Tertullian's Trinitarian formulation identified within the *substantia Dei*, both substantive (i.e., individual existence) and personal (i.e., Economic procession). Because the Spirit is the one who unifies the *substantia Dei* and yet, also proceeds from the Father and the Son as *Persona*, there exists within Tertullian a two-fold expectation of the Spirit's indwelling within the Church. First, just as the descension of the Holy Spirit upon the Virgin Mary was considered a Trinitarian descension of the divine spirit; likewise, the indwelling of the Spirit within believers, constituted a Trinitarian indwelling. Tertullian explains, "Nam et ipsa ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus. In quo est Trinitas unuis diuinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus."[240] Thus, Tertullian could, in one instance, identify the Church with the Second Person, the incarnate *Sermo*,[241] and then later proclaim the Church was the "Church of the Spirit,"[242] without contradicting himself. Further, the divine Spirit's indwelling included the distinct personal operation of the Holy Spirit as the third sequential Person. The distinct operation of the Spirit, which is mirrored in Tertullian's prosopological exegesis, manifests itself in the operation of the Spirit as the designator of sacred space both individually and communally within the universal and apostolic Church. This designation allows him to appropriate to the Holy Spirit the operation of mediation.

The following chapter addresses the three primary operations of the Spirit in the life of the Church: sanctification, revelation, and discipline. The primary texts assessed in this chapter are *De Paenitentia*, *De Oratione*, *De Baptismo*, *De Pudicitia*, *De Idolatria*, and *De Fuga*. Section

---

[240] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. xvi (CCSL II, 1328).
[241] "In uno et altero ecclesia est, ecclesia uero Christus…" Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* X. vi. Latin Text, vid. "De Paenitentia," in *Tertulliani Opera Vol. I*. CCL., 337.
[242] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. xvii. "De Paenitentia," in *Tertulliani Opera Vol. II*. CCL., 1328.

I (pg. 59) shows how the reception of the Spirit in baptism constituted a blending of two paradigms in Antiquity—the religious paradigm of sacred landscapes and the socio-cultural paradigm of patronage. The indwelling of the Spirit consecrated the individual and the community, in which the Spirit bestowed *beneficium*. The first of these benefits was the operation of sanctification, which, in turn, enabled two distinct yet closely related operations. Section II (pg. 65) shows how Tertullian's Trinitarian designation of the Spirit as Trinitarian communicator, developed his view of progressive revelation. The assessment in Chapter 1, Section III (pg. _), which argues for a shared language of experience between Tertullian and the New Prophecy, heightened the 'ecstatic' manner of prophecy in the Holy Spirit's revelatory operation.

Moreover, we shall contend that since it is the unique operation of the Spirit to communicate the Trinity, the *vicarious power* of Christ communicated to the Church does not constitute a subordination of the Spirit. Instead, it constitutes an extension of Christ's power; however, extended via the procession of the Holy Spirit. Finally, Section III (pg. _) focuses on the Spirit's operation of instruction and discipline, an idea closely related to the previous two operations discussed. Here it is clear that because the Church exists as consecrated space, the life and well-being of the Church depend on her ability to maintain the integrity of that sacred space.

I: Divine Indwelling: Sacred Space and Divine Benefaction

In the background of Tertullian's conception of divine indwelling and the gift of the Spirit, rests the religious paradigm of sacred landscapes and the cultural paradigm of patronage. Both of these are separate and distinct systems in the Greco-Roman world; however, it is in Tertullian that these two ideas find their convergence. Furthermore, it is necessary to explain

both of these ideas in their context while also recognizing their manifestation in the theological summations of Tertullian.

The notion of 'sacred landscapes' stems from Beatrice Caseasu's identification that the employed iconoclasm of the Roman legion in North Africa produced a consecration or desecration of occupied space. These two acts coincided with one another since in consecrating a space to a specific deity from a pantheon of deities, other deities were consequentially desecrated from that space. In two particular accounts, before establishing a military camp, Roman legions erected images of specific deities, mostly Romanized versions of local deities,[243] to establish consecrated space of divine benefaction and blessing.[244] This notion of consecration was not limited to regions or designated land, as it could also include communities and individuals.[245] More than likely, such images of consecration were employed in everyday life for many events.[246]

Tertullian likewise considered divine indwelling to be a precluded by a consecration of sacred space. This belief has both individual as well as communal implications. Concerning individual indwelling, in *De Paenitentia*, pre-baptismal penance served as a means of designating sacred space. Tertullian explains this notion, stating,

> Cui praemnistram paenitentiam destinarat purgandis mentibus praepositam, uti quidquid error uetus inquinasset, quidquid in corde hominis ignorantia contaminasset, id paenitentia auerrens et eradens et foras abiciens quo se ille cum caelestibus bonis libens inferat.[247]

---

[243] Consider the syncretism of the Punic religions with the Roman pantheon in North Africa. Vid. Pages 5-6.
[244] Beatrice Caseau, "Sacred Landscapes," in *Late Antiquity*: *A Guide to The Postclassical World*, ed. by G.W. Bowrsock, et al. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 21.
[245] Ibid., 22.
[246] Consider the idolatrous connection which Tertullian makes between the hanging of wreaths in *De Idolatria* and or the work *De Corona*. Even everyday items could represent the consecration of space. Tertullian, *De Idolotria* XV; *De Corona* XII.
[247] Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* II. vi (CCSL I, 322-3). Compare this idea with Paul's description of the body a "temple" in 1 *Corinthians* 3:16.

Thus, penance operates as a means of preparation for the Spirit's indwelling, designating the space for consecration by the Spirit. In the pre-baptismal ritual, it was important for the proselyte to renounce "the devil and his pomp and his angels."[248] This vow functioned as a desecration of the designated space.[249] In renouncing the demonic forces associated with idolatry, it was then possible for the space to be consecrated by that which only is holy—the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the consecrated space was not just the individual, but also the community, for baptism was the act of joining a holy, consecrated community. This designation of sacred space was not just an individual designation but also a representation that the ecclesial community was designated as sacred space.

The communal aspect of consecration is shown clearly in a text like *De Pudicitia*. Here Tertullian closely associates the sins of fornication as not only shaming the Paraclete but also shaming the Church.[250] The Ecclesial community is, of course, dependent upon the unity of the one Spirit, which indwelled all believers. It was the responsibility of the Church to maintain the integrity of sacred space.[251]

Another paradigm that shaped Tertullian's doctrine of divine indwelling was the cultural system of patronage. In the Greco-Roman world, patronage was a social paradigm by which most interpersonal relationships were formed and maintained, usually between people of different social status. Thus, patronage was "an essential means of acquiring access to goods, protection, or opportunities for employment and advancement."[252]

---

[248] Tertullian, *De Spectaculis* IV. iii (CCSL I, 231). Cf. Tertullian, *De Corona* XIII vii (CCSL II, 1062).
[249] As Tertullian remarks elsewhere, "Itaque negat manifeste qui per quod agnoscitur tollit. Quid autem spei superset in eiusmodi homine? Nemo in castra hstium transit nisi proiectis armis suis, nisi destitutis signis et sacramentis principis sui, nisi pactus simul perire." The imagery here is clear: one cannot desert the military with removing the *Sacramentum* of their charge. They must first leave, and then take up new arms elsewhere. Tertullian, *De Spectaculis* XXIV. iv (CCSL I, 248).
[250] Tertullian *De Pudicitia* I. xxi-xxii (CCSL II, 1283).
[251] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* V; XIII.
[252] David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 96.

As a relational structure, more informal social bonds, such as between family and friends, could also be understood via the framework of patronage.[253] In essence, the system itself was "simply a chain or network of relationships" usually bound voluntarily through the expected "moral obligation" of reciprocity.[254] The ideal emphasis was on the spirit of giving rather than the gift (Lat. *Beneficium*) itself. Thus, in the late first century, Seneca defined *beneficium* as, "Benevola actio tribuens gaudium capiensque tribuendo in id, quod facit, prona et sponte sua parta. Itaque non, quid fiat aut quid detur, refert, sed qua mente…"[255] Likewise, the well reception of *beneficium* was to be returned with *gratium*. As David deSilva succinctly articulates, "grace must be met with grace; favor must always give birth to favor."[256]

Tertullian's doctrine of salvation and divine indwelling takes on this paradigm via a similar framework in which the explanation of the fall of man and the divine plan of salvation implies a system of benefits and grace. As Tertullian explains, "Itaque et populum sibi congregauit et multis bonitatis suae largitionibus fouit et ingratissimum totiens expertus ad paenitentiam semper hortatus ei praedicandae uniuersorum prophetarum emisit ora…"[257] In Tertullian's Trinitarian summation, the Father who orchestrated the divine plan of redemption, the incarnation and death of the Son initiates the efficacy of salvation, and it is the divine revelation of the Spirit which professes this *beneficium* of salvation via prophetic utterance. Elsewhere, in *De Oratione*, declaration of God's blessedness is out of remembrance and recognition of his benefits, undoubtedly this includes the gift of salvation and the divine Spirit.[258]

---

[253] Generally, relationships of reciprocity in which both parties were of equal status were considered to be under the term of "friendship." See David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*, 99.
[254] Ritva Williams, *Stewards, Prophets, Keepers of The Word: Leadership in The Early Church* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2006), 38-39.
[255] Seneca, *De Beneficiis* I. vi. Latin text, Seneca, "De Beneficiis," in *Moral Essays Vol. III*, trans. by John W. Basore, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 19.
[256] David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*, 105.
[257] Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* II. iv (CCSL I, 322).
[258] Tertullian, *De Oratione* III. ii (CCSL I, 259).

The antithesis to the *beneficium* of salvation is then the *ingratium* of sin. As Tertullian writes, "id est dei dono contumeliam facit: respuit datorem, cum datum deserit; negat beneficium, cum beneficium non honorat…Ita in dominum non modo contumax sed etiam ingratus apparet."[259] Thus, to continue to sin post-reception of the divine gift not only reflects disobedience but ungratefulness as well. Such ungratefulness should not be taken lightly, as Tertullian reminds his audience, "For do not many later fall away?"[260]

The convergence of the religious paradigm of sacred designation and the cultural paradigm of patronage is in the sacred rite of baptism. Tertullian associated the reception of the Holy Spirit with the rite of baptism.[261] Whereas pre-baptismal penance operates as a form of sacred designation, it is the Spirit who performs the actual consecration of that space. In *De Baptismo*, Tertullian draws a connection between the act of creation and the rite of baptism. In the act of creation, the Spirit's hovering over the waters indicates God's consecration of creation. Interestingly enough, once the divine spirit consecrates the waters of creation, their spiritual purpose of consecrating the proselyte is manifested in the very essence of water.[262] Because of this dual reality, of designation and consecration, in *De Paenitentia*, Tertullian remarks, "mox gratiam pollicitus quam in extremitatibus temporum per spiritum suum uniuerso orbi inluminaturus esset, praeire intinctionem paenitentiae iussit…"[263]

---

[259] Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* V. v-vi (CCSL I, 328).
[260] "Non enim multi postea excidunt?" Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* VI. xiii (CCSL I, 331).
[261] Maxwell E. Johnson, "The Apostolic Tradition," in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, ed. Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen B. Westerfield Tucker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 38. cf. John 3:5.
[262] Here, too, Tertullian's Stoicism is revealing itself. Two bodies can exist simultaneously, and the qualities themselves are bodies. It is not then unusual that there would be a *quality* that is communicated and becomes a part of the *operation* of the *substantia*. Therefore, in the rite of baptism, when the divine Spirit is once again invoked, the efficacy of that communicated *quality* is operable within the divine rite. Following this line of reasoning, it would seem that baptizing with anything but water would not constitute a true baptism. Tertullian, *De Baptismo* IV. i (CCSL I, 279). For a discussion of Stoic ontology and 'bodies', vid. Pages 35-6.
[263] In this passage, the rite of baptism is denoted by 'intinctionem,' which is paired with penance. Tertullian, *De Paenitentia* II. iv (CCSL I 322).

As a consequence of the baptismal rite, the gift of the Spirit bestowed; however, not in the immersion of water per se.[264] The gift of the Spirit was bestowed in the laying of hands. This point reveals a divergence in one aspect from the cultural paradigm of patronage. Whereas this system was dependent upon a giver and receiver, it was not uncommon for a mediator to operate between the two. For example, the apostle Paul once functioned as a mediator between the Roman Church and his patron, Phoebe.[265] However, in the present case of baptism, the one laying the hands is not operating as a mediator of divine power. Tertullian's doctrine of power and authority within the Church shows that one baptizing is passive in the Spirit's bestowal. The order of 'rights' gave bishops the proper first right to baptize, and then presbyters the second. Nevertheless, technically, Tertullian regarded all, except women,[266] as having the ability to baptize because "proinde et baptismum, aeque dei census, ab omnibus exerceri potest."[267] This conclusion is only logical if he considered that the person performing the baptism has no real mediating role outside of being a part of the Spirit community. It is the Spirit who baptizes, and it is the Father and Son who provide the gift of the divine Spirit at their choosing.

Post-baptismal penance then, as rooted within the rite of baptism, was solely within the power and authority of the Spirit, as God, and not by the mediation of the priesthood. The critical

---

[264] Everett Ferguson, "Laying on of Hands: Its Significance in Ordination," *JTS* 26, No. 1 (1975): 9, URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/23959782. Cf. Kilian McDonnell, "Communion Ecclesiology and Baptism in The Spirit: Tertullian and The Early Church," *TS* 49 (1988), 679. Accessed May 29, 2020. http://cdn.theologicalstudies.net/49/49.4/49.4.4.pdf.

[265] *Romans* 16:1-2; Erlend MacGillivray disagrees with translating the term *προστάτις* as denoting the classical understanding of patronage. His main objections stem from his misunderstanding of classical patronage as an "inherently exploitative system" and an intrinsically a "hierarchical relationship." The relationship between Paul and others, he concludes, was the opposite. While exploitation was always a potential downfall of such a system, there were many instances where patronage existed between equal members of society and also necessitated a semblance of mutual exchange. See Erlend D. MacGillivray, "Romans 16:2, προστάτις/προστάτις, and The Application of Reciprocal relationships to New Testament Texts," *NT* 53, No. 2 (2011):194, URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/23056248. Compare with the example of Dio Chrysostom, "Epistle II," in *Discourses Vol. V*, trans. by H. Lamar Crosby (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), 356-57.

[266] One of the most unfortunate features of Tertullian is his apparent sexism. Here he takes a stance that women, on account of their lack of leadership, should not baptize. Tertullian, *De Baptismo* XVII. iv-v.

[267] Tertullian, *De Baptismo* XVII. ii (CCSL I, 291-2).

conflict of *De Pudicitia* is whether the Church, that is, the Episcopal authority structures, could forgive sins. Tertullian's response was that the power to forgive sins belongs to God and God alone.[268] It can further be surmised from this point that the Holy Spirit, as both gift and giver, was also the source of other gifts and operations within the Church. This belief was only possible in a real Trinitarian sense. These two points are revealed in the following section, where Tertullian's understanding of the Holy Spirit, as Trinitarian communicator, continued this proper operation in the indwelling of the Church.

II: Trinitarian Communication and Progressive Revelation

In consecrating the sacred space of the individual and community, the indwelling of the Spirit operates within the Church as the communicator of the *regula fidei* and prophetic revelation. Both of these concepts find their locus in the assertion of Tertullian that the Spirit was the *vicarius Christi* (the "Vicar of Christ).[269] Rather than this title revealing subordination,[270] the relationship between *Sermo* and *Spiritus* is actually in mind here: The *Spiritus*, which has the same *Ratio* and *Sophia* of *Sermo*, can communicate perfectly that same *Ratio* and *Sophia* to His Church. This communication is generally identified among scholars in Tertullian's prophetic emphasis; however, the Spirit's operation manifests clearly in his universal epistemology. Therefore, in this section, we will evaluate how the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from *Sermo*, leads Christians to a natural knowledge of the world and divine knowledge of God.

In one work addressed to Carthage's pagan community, Tertullian attempts to use natural reason to establish a common ground with the pagans. He forms the text as if he is in a

[268] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. xvii (CCSL II, 1328).
[269] Tertullian, *De Prescriptione Haereticorum* XVIII. i (CCSL I, 209).
[270] J. Van Oort, "The Holy Spirit and the Early Church: Doctrine ad Confession," 2.

courtroom, presenting what he considers to be new testimony defending the Christian faith.[271] What is fascinating about his overall argument is its assertion that all reason is grounded in divine revelation. He explains:

> Haec testimonia animae quanto uero tanto simplicia, quanto simplicia tanto uulgaria, quanto uulgaria tanto communia, quanto communia tanto naturalia, quanto naturalia tanto diuina…Quid anima possit de principali instituore praesumere, in te est aestimare de ea quae in te est. Senti illam quae ut sentias efficit. Recogita in praesagiis uatem, in omnibus augurem, in euentibus prospicem. Mirum. Si a deo data mouit homini diuinare?[272]

This statement is quite logical for Tertullian, considering his affinities for Stoic logic and rhetoric. Since Stoics espoused that the divine, rational, spirit was present in all people via the divine spark of the soul, then the knowledge of the world lay within the very fabric of the human soul.[273] However, it also makes sense considering Tertullian's association of *ratio* with the creative act of *Sermo*.[274] In his exegesis *Imago Dei* of *Genesis* 1, he surmises that God breathed His *ratio* into man, which meant that the quality of reason was imbued within his very soul.[275] Thus, it would seem for Tertullian, that the divine reason imbued in man makes it that all reason, in its perfect form, is rooted within the divine. Thus, he can make the statement that "quanto communia tanto naturalia, quanto naturalia tanto diuina."[276] Because of the divine nature of *ratio*, Tertullian believed that since the Paraclete dwelled within believers, that the

---

[271] Tertullian, *De Testimonio Animae* I. cf. Robert Sider, *Christian and Pagan in The Roman Empire: The Witness of Tertullian* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University Press, of America, 2001), 71.
[272] Tertullian, *De Testimonio Animae* V. ii (CCSL I, 180).
[273] Robert Sider, *Christian and Pagan in The Roman Empire: The Witness of Tertullian*, 72-73.
[274] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* VII; cf. Reason is said to be good only because it proceeds from God. While it is clear he is not necessarily denoting a divine procession, the fact that *ratio* proceeds from the divine substance of the Father and is identified with the Second Person, *Sermo*, establishes a natural foundation for the divine source of reason. Cf. Tertullian, *De Fuga in Persecutione* IV (CCSL II, 1139-40).
[275] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* V.
[276] Tertullian, *De Testimonio Animae* V. ii (CCSL I, 180).

administrative service of revelation meant that the Spirit also communicated the ratio of Sermo in believers perfectly.[277]

This general epistemology included the imperfect understanding of the pagans who were lacking the Spirit of all truth,[278] and also the progressive revelation of the Spirit in prophetic utterance. Before articulating the revelatory operation of the Paraclete in prophecy, it is crucial to clarify the relationship Tertullian considered between the 'New Prophecy' and the *Regula Fidei* of the apostolic church.

For Tertullian, the Church's binding authority was foundationally established upon the *regula fidei*, which was instructed to the believer by the Paraclete and handed down through the Apostles.[279] It is the Apostolic doctrine of Scripture mediated via the Holy Spirit's power that signified the true Church.[280] It is here that Robert Evans bemoans what he perceives to be regrettable in Tertullian's thinking. He explains, "What Tertullian has here done is to pound a heavy blow in driving a wedge between a conception of the Church as Spirit-filled, and Spirit-led, and a conception of the Church as an institution with historical, empirical continuity with its regularized marks."[281] Tertullian indeed rejects the authority of the bishops and priests to determine solely the disciplines of the Church; however, it is erroneous to assert that he detached the revelation of the Paraclete completely from the *Regula Fidei*. In a text such as *Adversus Praxean*, where Tertullian most clearly espouses the Spirit's operation as Trinitarian

---

[277] Peter Brown notes the connection of 'conversion' with 'revelation' by various religious groups in Late Antiquity. Christianity was unique in that, it not only offered revelation of the metaphysical world, but provided its followers with the knowledge necessary to live in their present life. Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity* (New York: W. M. Norton & Company, 1989), 52-56.
[278] Tertullian, *De Spectaculis* XXI. i.
[279] Consider the *regula fidei* explained in *Adversus Praxean* II.
[280] It is important to note that, even in this supposed 'Pre-Montanist' passage of Tertullian, there remains a distinction between the Holy Spirit's power conferred to the Apostles and the *doctrine/teaching* of the Apostles which succeeded as 'seeds' to the churches. Tertullian, *Prae. Her.* XX. Cf. Tertullian, *De Pud.* XXI.
[281] Robert Evans, *One and Holy: The Church in Latin Patristic Thought*, 29.

communicator, the communication of the Trinity is never detached from the *Regula Fidei*. Instead, it is built upon that 'Rule.'[282]

Therefore, Tertullian believes that the teaching of doctrine and discipline solely belongs to the administration of the Paraclete,[283] as defined by his divine mission from the Son.[284] In this way, what the *Regula Fidei* signifies, not authority or power, but teaching in the strictest sense is only sourced in the divine *ratio*.[285] Here we once again see how Tertullian desires to separate any mediation that may occur between the authority of the Church and the teaching and discipline of the Spirit. In the Apostles case, he argues that they had the power to do specific works of God because of their unique service to God.[286] The same could be asserted to the Prophets of old. However, this power, the gifts which the Apostle received, were not mediated via the office of the Church. Instead, doctrine alone was handed down. Furthermore, to those who objected, Tertullian presented this challenge, "Exhibe igitur et nunc mihi, apostolice, prophetica exempla, ut agnoscam diuinitatem, et uindica tibi delictorum eiusmodi remittendorum potestatem."[287] *Doctrines* were being set up by members of the Church to show the power and authority of individuals, but this restricted any real mediation of the divine gifts on that part of the community. The God who dwells within all bestows His gifts graciously to all. A vital provision was that of revelation, which originated in the Spirit's indwelling.

However, Tertullian is unwilling to completely detach the *Ecclesia Spiritus* from the apostolic teachings of the *Regula Fidei* of the Apostles. This 'Rule' forms a designation or

---

[282] It should not go without notice that Tertullian immediately, after declaring the heresy of Praxeas, states the *Regula Fidei* he received from the Church. This 'Rule' forms the foundation of everything, which is argued in the treatise. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* II. i-ii (CCSL II, 1160).
[283] Tertullian, *De Verg. Vel.* I. iv-v (CCSL II, 1209-10).
[284] Tertullian, *De Monogamia* III. iii-iv (CCSL II, 1230).
[285] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI.
[286] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. i-i
[287] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia* XXI. v (CCSL II, 1326).

boundary between what constitutes orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Heresies were those doctrines contrary or 'innovative' to the teachings of the Apostles. What then do we make of Tertullian's relationship with Montanism? Was it not a 'New' form of prophecy? Tertullian certainly did not think so. Their teachings were not innovative in the sense of being contrary to Apostolic teaching; they were innovative in that, "nouis, quia nunc revelantur."[288] Thus, the revelation of the 'New Prophecy' was simply another stage in the development of prophecy.

It is here that Tertullian develops a progressive theory of divine revelation. The most apparent manifestation of this is espoused in the stages of revelation expressed via the metaphor of human development. He writes:

> Sic et iustitia (nam idem Deus iustitiae et creaturae) primo fuit in rudimentis, natura Deum metuens; dehinc perlegem et prophetas promouit in infantiam, dehinc per euangelium efferbuit in iuuentutem, nunc per Paracletum componitur in maturitatem. Hic erit solus a Christo magister et dicenus uerendus. Non enim ab se loquitur, sed quae mandantur a Christo. Hic solus antecessor, quia solus post Christum. Hunc qui receperunt, ueritatem consuetudini anteponunt. Hunc qui audierunt usque, nunc prophetantem, uirgines contegunt.[289]

The above sequence is identical to Tertullian's sequence of processions in *Adversus Praxean*, and it follows his exegetical approach to Old Testament prophecies.

The stages of development reveal distinct periods and distinct stages of revelation in which distinct Persons are revealed. Johannes Oort sees this sequence and interprets it as subordination. However, the Spirit as 'antecessor' does not denote a lessening or subordination of the Holy Spirit. Consider that in the divine sequence of procession, the Son is a consort in the divine work of creation, which originates in the Father's mind.[290] Likewise, the Spirit, who

---

[288] The full Latin reads, *fidem dicente pro eis integritate praedicationis, licet nouis, quia nunc revelantur, licet onerosis, quia nec nunc sustinentur…*" Tertullian, *De Monogamia* II. iv (CCSL II, 1230). This, of course, is Tertullian misinterpreting Paul's statement in *Romans* 7:3-5. Cf. John Morgan-Wynne, *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature ca. AD. 90-200*, 237.
[289] Tertullian, *De Virginibus Velandis* I. vii (CCSL II, 1210).
[290] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* XV. ix (CCSL II, 1180).

proceeds from both the Father and the Son, is a consort in the revelation of salvation. Therefore, what Tertullian articulates is not subordination, but sequence—pneumatic preeminence that unifies the Three.

The Spirit, in particular, reveals the various disciplines necessary to maintain the sacred integrity of the community. Since the Spirit's indwelling consecrates and designates the community as a sacred space, and the gift of the Spirit manifests in the escalation of revelation, there is a third operation that is a fulfillment of these two operations—discipline.

III: Community Discipline: The Expectation of Consecration and Revelation

In a letter written to the martyrs in prison, Tertullian once encouraged them with the following words: "Proinde uos, benedicti, quod cum que hoc durum est, ad exercitationem uirtutum animi et corporis deputate. Bonum agonem subituri estis in quo aonthetes Deus uiuus est, xystarches Spiritus Sanctus, corona aeternitatis…"[291] These words must have been a comforting reminder to those who were potentially awaiting their death. Martyrdom was remembered by the community and Martyr letters were recited during local services. However, for the present study, what is important is the analogy which Tertullian ascribes to the operation of the Spirit, *xystarches*. Considering the religious landscape of North Africa,[292] it is unsurprising that the Holy Spirit would not simply operate in revelation without also training or challenging the Ecclesial community towards discipline. Martyrdom, perhaps due to its public nature, was the most evident means by which the Holy Spirit instructed discipline and it could develop virtues within a believer.[293]

[291] Tertullian, *Ad Martyras* III. iii (CCSL I, 5).
[292] Vid. Pages 9-12.
[293] Tertullian, *Ad Martyras* III. iii.

Tertullian uses other metaphors, implying a personal and instructive operation of the Holy Spirit. In *De Fuga*, Tertullian reminds his readers to seek counsel from the Spirit, who will in turn, respond in the Spirit.[294] This reveals a similar operation of instruction and discipline by the Spirit. Or, in a previously mentioned passage, in *De Idolatria*, the Holy Spirit directly gives a vision to a man in order to keep him from hanging wreaths upon his estate.[295]

But the most apparent expectation of the Spirit's operation of discipline manifested itself in Tertullian's eschatological reflections. Tertullian, perhaps as a consequence of his affiliation with Montanism, held a belief that the Parousia was imminent, and that the Holy Spirit's operation in contemporaneous prophecy was a sign of the times.[296] In one significant passage of *De Cultu Feminarum*, Tertullian spoke against the dying of women's hair, using eschatology as a means of demeaning such features. He wrote, "Nec est aeternitas uestra de capilli iuuentute: hanc incorruptibilitatem habemus superindeuere ad nouum dominium, quam monarchia acacias pollicetur."[297] The irony which he espouses is clear, that which is perishable is nothing compared to the new dwelling received at the eschaton which is incorruptible. In other words, Tertullian asks, why settle for less?

In summary, it was the discipline of the community which maintained the sacred space of the Ecclesial community's integrity. The Spirit, which continued in its operation via indwelling, instructed and trained the community for ethical living. The reward was eternity—imperishable crowns and a permanent dwelling among the Godhead. The Holy Spirit, instead of being a

---

[294] Tertullian, *De Fuga in Persecutione* IX. i.
[295] Tertullian, *De Idolotria* XV. vii-viii (CCSL II, 1116).
[296] For the imminence of the eschaton, cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* Bk. III. Cap. XXIV-VI; *Apologeticum* XXXII.
[297] Tertullian, *De Cultu Fem.* Bk. II. Cap. VI. iv (CCSL I, 360). Cf. *Adversus Marcionem* Bk. III. Cap. XXV.

subordinate power, reveals the unity of the Three and the expectation that the rewards of the Spirit are given through the mediation of the Holy Spirit to believers. The Church then was not a mediator of indwelling, nor of discipline. Like the self-commendation of prophecy, the Church was passive in its administration. The Church was truly Spirit filled and thereby Spirit led.

CONCLUSION

When one evaluates the Holy Spirit's role in Tertullian's primary Trinitarian work, *Adversus Praxean*, and his understanding of the divine Spirit's indwelling, it is apparent that the Holy Spirit is not a subordinate or a 'vicarious power.' Instead, the Holy Spirit, as that which proceeds and unifies the Father and Son, the Holy Spirit operates uniquely within the Church's life as that which consecrates, reveals, and provides the disciplinary knowledge to protect the sacred integrity of the community. The present work provided evidence for this interpretation of Tertullian by the preceding three chapters.

In Chapter 1, we established the central role that persecution and martyrdom played in the North African Church, particularly in Carthage. Considering the popular and generally localized nature of persecution, it is unsurprising that discipline and ethics were central in Tertullian's writings. Moreover, we established the shared language of indwelling, which existed between the New Prophecy and Tertullian. This chapter also uniquely highlighted the language of self-commendation in prophetic utterance, which both the New Prophecy and Tertullian utilized in establishing the distinct emphasis of pneumatic indwelling (Chapter 1).

The Second Chapter evaluated the term *substantia* in Tertullian's writings, explicitly highlighting the term's ontological applications in *Adversus Praxean* and similar passages. Contrary to Stead's materialistic application, it was established that substantia function as a boundary of ontology. Unlike Evans contention that substantia functioned exclusively as *πρώτη οὐσία*, it was shown that *substantia* designated both particular ontology (i.e., an individual being) as well as the collective ontology (i.e., distinct *persona*). Tertullian's appropriation of the Stoic ontological category of *corpus* enabled a more lucid link between both designations.

Furthermore, Tertullian's connection of *spiritus* with the *substantia Dei* grounds the

divine procession of the Third Person as that which flows from the Father and Son, and yet unifies the Three. From this logic, he uniquely appropriated to the Holy Spirit the operation of Trinitarian communicator. In Tertullian's summation, the Trinitarian indwelling within the Ecclesial community provided grounding for the Holy Spirit's distinct personal operations. Thus, the Church was both *Ecclesia Trinitis* and *Ecclesia Spiritus* (Chapter 2).

In the last Chapter, the Holy Spirit's operations were discussed as it pertained to the indwelling of the Divine Spirit within the Church. The first operation discussed is the Spirit's role in consecrating sacred space and the divine benefaction. In the rite of Baptism, the two paradigms of sacred landscapes and Patronage find their locus, for it is the Spirit that uniquely consecrates the believer before indwelling, and it is the Father and Son who bestow the Holy Spirit. Thus, Baptism is a purely divine act.

The second operation discussed was the Holy Spirit's operation in progressive divine revelation. While Tertullian upheld the Stoic doctrine of 'common ideas,' it was the human soul's origin in the divine *ratio* which created the foundation for this idea and enabled him to espouse an extension of this doctrine. The Spirit operates as the third in a sequence of special revelation, and believers, who have the Spirit in them, likewise have the perfect *ratio*. People outside the community, who do not have the Spirit do not have the perfect *ratio*.

Therefore, the third operation, discipline, is closely related to the first and second and fulfills the purpose of the first two. The Spirit, which reveals the disciplines that maintain the Ecclesial Community's integrity, equips believers with the ability to resist cultural and religious temptation. The evidence for this is Tertullian's emphasis on prophecy and the Spirit's continual role in communicating with the Church (Chapter 3).

Our study, while extensive, is in no way comprehensive in its evaluation of Tertullian's Pneumatology. Because the invocation of the Holy Spirit disproportionally appears in his Ecclesial texts, it was most suitable to concentrate on Ecclesiology. However, the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit certainly influenced other facets of Tertullian's theology. Two topics not overly evaluated were his eschatology and his view of the afterlife. Concerning the former, Tertullian, perhaps as a consequence of his affiliation with Montanism, held a belief that the Parousia was imminent, and that the Holy Spirit's operation in contemporary prophecy was a sign of the times. As such, eschatology is prevalent in several of Tertullian's writings. It would be fascinating to investigate the Spirit's role and how the Holy Spirit operates within Tertullian's eschatological system. Considering the Spirit's role in prophecy, it is not unlikely that the Holy Spirit is central in his eschatological expectations Furthermore, Tertullian held a vision of the afterlife that centralized the purgation of sins and the rewards of one's life.[298] Considering the role of both discipline and, subsequently, the Paraclete's operation in revealing discipline,[299] it would seem that Tertullian's view of the afterlife is directly related to the two. Therefore, an assessment worth evaluating is Tertullian's view of the afterlife.

A secondary topic that would be worth investigating is whether Tertullian's Pneumatology, both Trinitarian and Ecclesial aspects, were influential for later writers, especially in the Western tradition. It was pointed out at the close of the Second Chapter that Augustine of Hippo's Trinitarian formulation reveals similar, if not identical, ascriptions concerning the Holy Spirit and the Trinity. Novation was only briefly discussed, necessitating elsewhere a more extensive evaluation. Thus, this is another topic that would potentially reveal a

[298] The most explicit allusion to a post-mortem, interim state in Tertullian's writings comes from *De Anima* LV-VIII.
[299] Tertullian, *De Anima* LVIII. viii (CCSL II, 869).

strand of thought, initiated in Tertullian, that is, however, continuous in Western Trinitarian formulations.

Nevertheless, our evaluation of the Trinitarian foundations and the Ecclesial operations of the Holy Spirit resolve the conflict of subordination and reassert the centrality of the Holy Spirit in Tertullian's theology. Rather than being a 'vicarious power' of the Second Person, the Third Person's procession and operation is an extension of the divine union. The extension does not make the Holy Spirit subordinate to the Father and Son. Tertullian's association of the Holy Spirit with the Divine Substance precludes such an interpretation. Furthermore, the prominence of the Spirit does not preclude the significance of the Father and the Son. All Three Persons are *Una Substantia*, and therefore, all Three are unified in their operation. This balance of unity and distinction is where the genius of Tertullian resides. Any scholar who attempts to understand Tertullian must first recognize this balance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. deSilva, David. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000.

Allen, Reginald. *Greek Philosophy: Thales to Aristotle*. New York: The Free Press, 1991.

Aphrodisias, Alexander. "Physicae Doctrinae Fundamenta." *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta Vol. II*. Edited by Hans von Arnim. Leipzig: K.G. Saur Munchen, 2004.

Apuleius. "Apology." In *Apuleius: Apologia, Florida, De Deo Socratis*. Translated by Christopher P. Jones. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017.

———. *Metamorphoses Books VII-XI*. Translated by J. Arthur Hanson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Aristotle. *The Categories*. Translated by Harold P. Cook. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.

———. *Metaphysics: Books I-IX*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933.

———. "Politics." In *Aristotle XXI: Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. CCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944.

Augustine. *Confessions*. Translated by Maria Boulding. Hyde Park: New City Press, 2018.

———. *The Trinity*. Translated by Edmund Hill. Hyde Park: New City Press, 2015.

Aune, David. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and The Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1983.

Aurelius, Marcus. "Meditations." In *Marcus Aurelius*. Edited by C. R. Haines. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Baltussen, Han. *The Peripatetics: Aristotle's Heirs 322 BCE – 200CE*. London: Rutledge, 2016.

Barnes, Timothy. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

———. "The Chronology of Montanism." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NEW SERIES, 21, no. 2 (1970): 403-08. Accessed March 03, 2019. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23959280.

———. “Tertullian’s “Scorpiace”.” *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 20, no. 1 (1969): 105-32. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23960582.

Barrett, C. K. “The Holy Spirit in The Fourth Gospel.” *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 1, no. 1 (1950): 1-15. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23956211.

Bates, Matthew. *The Birth of The Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretations of The Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Bobzien, Susanne. “Early Stoic Determinism.” *Revue De Métaphysique Et De Morale*, no. 4 (2005): 489-516. Accessed May 11, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/40904101.

Brent, Allen. *Hippolytus and The Roman Church in The Third Century: Communities in Tension before a Monarch-Bishop*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.

———. “Introduction.” In *St. Cyprian of Carthage: On The Church, Select Letters*.11-44. PPS. Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2006.

———. *The Imperial Cult & The Development of Church Order*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Briggman, Anthony. *Irenaeus of Lyons and The Theology of The Holy Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

———. “Measuring Justin’s Approach to the Spirit: Trinitarian Conviction and Binitarian Orientation.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 63, no. 2 (2009): 107-37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20474910.

———. “Spirit-Christology in Irenaeus: A Closer Look.” *Vigiliae Christianae 66,* No.1 (2012):1-19. Accessed April 20, 2020. https://www-jstor-org.dtl.idm.oclc.org/stable/41480513.

———. “The Holy Spirit as The Unction Of Christ In Irenaeus.” *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NEW SERIES, 61, no. 1 (2010): 171-93. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43665024.

Brown, Peter. *Augustine of Hippo*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

———. *The World of Late Antiquity*. New York: W. M. Norton & Company, 1989.

Burge, Gary, Lynn Cohick, and Gene Green. *The New Testament in Antiquity: A Survey of The New Testament within its Cultural Context* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

Burns Jr., J. and Jensen, Robin. *Christianity in Roman Africa: The Development of Its Practices and Beliefs*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2014.

Carpenter, H. J. "Creeds and Baptismal Rites in The First Four Centuries." *The Journal of Theological Studies*44, no. 173/174 (1943): 1-11. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23957089.

Caseau, Beatrice. "Sacred Landscapes." In *Late Antiquity*: *A Guide to The Postclassical World*. Edited by G.W. Bowrsock, et al. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Chadwick, John. *Tertullian and Montanism*. Boston: The Christian Examiner, 1863.

Charlesworth, James Eds., "The Sibylline Oracles: Book 2." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol. I: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Translated by J.J. Collins. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 1983.

Church, F. Forrester. "Sex and Salvation in Tertullian." *The Harvard Theological Review* 68, no. 2 (1975): 83-101. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1509087.

Chrysostom, Dio. "Epistle II." In *Discourses Vol. V*. Translated by H. Lamar Crosby. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Cicero. *De Natura Deorum Academica*. Translated by H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

———. "De Re Publica." In *Cicero XVI: De Re Publica, De Legibus*. Translated by Clinton Keyes. CCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Clark, Kelly James. "Trinity or Tritheism?" *Religious Studies* 32, no. 4 (1996): 463-76. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20008053.

Cohen, S. Marc. "Aristotle's Metaphysics." Edited by Edward N. Zalta. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016). Accessed February 23, 2020. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/aristotle-metaphysics.

Cyprian. "Epistle XXVI." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* V. Translated by Ernest Wallis. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

———. "Epistle LIX," In *On the Church: Select Letters*. Translated by Allen Brent. PPS. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006.

Daley, Brian. *The Hope of The Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 1991.

Davies, J. G. "Tertullian, "De Resurrectione Carnis LXIII": A Note on The Origins of Montanism." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 6, no. 1 (1955): 90-94. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23955982.

Decret, François. *Early Christianity in North Africa*. Havertown: James Clarke Company, 2011.

De Soyres, John. *Montanism and The Primitive Church: A Study in The Ecclesiastical History of The Second Century*. Cambridge: Deighton & Bell, 1878.

"Didache." In *The Apostolic Fathers*. 3rd Edition. Edited by Michael Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Diogenes Laertius. "Zenonis Fragmenta et Placita." In *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta Vol. I*. Edited by Hans von Arnim. Leipzig: K.G. Saur Munchen, 2004.

Dunn, Geoffry. *Tertullian*. ECF. New York: Routledge Publishing, 2004.

Enslin, Morton S. "Puritan of Carthage." *The Journal of Religion*27, no. 3 (1947): 197-212. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1197574.

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,———.

Evans, Ernest. *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1948.

———. *Tertullian's Treatise on The Incarnation*. London: S.P.C.K., 1956.

———. *Tertullian's Treatise on The Resurrection*. London S.P.C.K., 1960.

———. *Tertullian's Tract on The Prayer*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2016.

Farmer, Hugh. "The Holy Spirit in The Church." *Life of the Spirit (1946-1964)* 7, no. 84 (1953): 533-38. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43704261.

Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

———. "Laying on of Hands: Its Significance in Ordination," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 26, No. 1 (1975): 1-12. Accessed February 12, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23959782.

Floor, L. "The Lord and the Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel." *Neotestamentica* 2 (1968): 122-30. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43047710.

Freeman, Charles. "New Beginnings: The Emergence of A Latin Christianity." In *A New History of Early Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Freeman-Grenville, G.S.P. "The Date of The Outbreak of Montanism." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* Vol. 5, No. 1 (1954): 7-15. Accessed January 21, 2019. Doi:10.1017/s0022046900068044.

Frede, Michael. "Principles of Stoic Grammar." In *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, 301-37. University of Minnesota Press, 1987. Accessed June 20, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.cttttpfd.20.

Frend, W.H.C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in The Early Church*. New York: Anchor Books, 1965.

Garnsey, Peter. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Gwynn, David M. "Episcopal Leadership." In *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*. Edited by Scott Fitzgerald Johnson, 876-915. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hefferman, Thomas. *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Heine, Ronald. *The Montanist Oracles and Testimonia*, Patristic Monograph Series 14. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989.

Herodian. *History of The Empire II*. Translated by C. R. Whitaker. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Herodotus. *The Histories*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Hughes, Kyle. "The Spirit Speaks: Pneumatological Innovation in the Scriptural Exegesis of Justin and Tertullian." *Vigiliae Christianae 69*, No. 5 (2015): 463-83. Accessed March 10, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24754534.

Higgins, A. J. B. "The Latin Text of Luke in Marcion and Tertullian." *Vigiliae Christianae* 5, no. 1 (1951): 1-42. doi:10.2307/1582244.

Hippolytus. *Refutation of All Heresies*. Translated by M. David Litwa. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. I*. Translated by W. H. Rambaut. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

Irwin, T.H. "Stoic Individuals." *Philosophical Perspectives* 10 (1996):459-80. Accessed February 16, 2019. doi:10.2307/2216257.

Jennings, Craig P. "Aspects of Ante-Nicene Pneumatology: Modern Pneumatological Controversies in the Light of Patristic Theology," PhD.diss., Bob Jones University,1985.

Jerome. "Lives of Illustrious Men." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Father Vol. III*. Translated by Ernest Cushing. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

———. "Letter XLI." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Vol. VI*. Translated by Hon. W. H. Fremantle. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

Johnson, Maxwell E. "The Apostolic Tradition." In *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*. Edited by Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen B. Westerfield Tucker, 32-75. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kitzler, Peter. "Tertullian's Use of 'Substantia' In 'De Carne Christi.'" *Hermes* 142, no. 4 (2014): 505-11. Accessed February 10, 2019. www.jstor.org/stable/43652958.

Kunkle, Wolfgang. *An Introduction to Roman Legal and Constitutional History*. Translated by J. M. Kelly. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Matthews, J.F. Review of *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. By Timothy Barnes, *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1973), accessed April 3, 2019, http://www.tertullian.org/articles/barnes_jts_review.htm.

Mattingly, J. R. "Early Stoicism and the Problem of Its Systematic Form." *The Philosophical Review* 48, no. 3 (1939): 273-95. Accessed July 15, 2019. Doi:10.2307/2180639.

McDonnell, Kilian. "Communion Ecclesiology and Baptism in The Spirit: Tertullian and The Early Church." *TS* 49 (1988): 671-693. Accessed May 29, 2020. http://cdn.theologicalstudies.net/49/49.4/49.4.4.pdf.

———. "Does Origen Have a Trinitarian Doctrine of the Holy Spirit?" *Gregorianum* 75, no. 1 (1994): 5-35. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23579230.

Milavec, Aaron. *The Didache: Faith, Hope, & Life of The Earliest Christian Communities, 50-70 C.E.* New York: Newman Press, 200.

Morgan-Wynne John. *Holy Spirit and Religious Experience in Christian Literature A.D. 90-200*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.

———. "The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr." *Vigiliae Christianae* 38, no. 2 (1984): 172-77. doi:10.2307/1583062.

Novatian. "A Treatise on The Trinity." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol. V*. Translated by Robert Ernest Wallis. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. "Montanism and Its Trinitarian Significance." *Church History* 25, no. 2 (1956): 99-109. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3161195.

Pesthy-Simon, Monika. "The Meaning of the Martyr's Sacrifice," in *Isaac, Iphigeneia, and Ignatius: Martyrdom and Human Sacrifice*. New York: Central European University Press, 2017.

Picard, G. “Carthage From The Battle at Himera to Agathocles Invasion.” In *The Cambridge History of Ancient History Vol. VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Powell, Douglas. “Tertullianists and Cataphrygians.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 29, no. 1 (1975): 33-54. Accessed May, 2019. doi:10.2307/1582900.

Oden, Thomas. *How Africa Shaped The Christian Mind*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

Oort, J. Van. “The Holy Spirit and the Early Church: Doctrine ad Confession.” *HS* 67 (2011): 1-8. Accessed December 30, 2019. doi: http:// dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts. v67i3.1120.

Origen. “Against Celsus.” In *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* IV. Translated by Fredrick Crombie. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

———. *On First Principles*. Translated by G. W. Butterworth. Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 2013.

———. *Treatise on The Passover and Dialogue with Heraclides*. Translated by Robert Daly. ACW. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

Orsuto, Donna. “The Father's Spirit of Sonship: A Significant Contribution to Trinitarian Theology.” *Gregorianum* 78, no. 1 (1997): 147-53. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23579581.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine Vol. 1*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Philo. “On The Eternity of The World.” In *The Works of Philo*. Translated by C. D. Yonge. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000.

Plotinus. “Ennead VI.” In *Plotinus Vol. VI*. Translated by A. H. Armstrong. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

———. *The Six Enneads*. Translated by Stephen MacKenna and B. S. Page. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952.

Plutarch. “On the Principle of Cold.” In *Plutarch Moralia Vol. XII*. Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology Vol. II*. Utrecht-Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 1975.

Rankin, David. *Tertullian and The Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Reesor, Margaret E. “Fate and Possibility in Early Stoic Philosophy.” *Phoenix* 19, no.4 (1965): 285-97. Accessed, December 18, 2019. doi:10.2307/1085828.

Robeck, Cecil M. *Prophecy in Carthage: Perpetua, Tertullian, and Cyprian*. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 1992.

Roth, Dieter T. "Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in "Adversus Marcionem"." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NEW SERIES, 59, no. 2 (2008): 580-97. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23971061.

Rowe, C. K. "The Trinity in The Letters of St. Paul and Hebrews." In *The Oxford Handbook of The Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Saint, William P. *Tertullian: Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage*. ACW. New York: Newman Press, 1951.

———. *Treatises on Penance: On Penitence and On Purity*. ACW. New York: Newman Press, 1959.

Saller, Richard P. *Personal Patronage Under The Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Schaff, Phillip. *History of The Christian Church Vol. II*. Fifth Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1910.

Schellenberg, Ryan S. "Subsistence, Swapping, and Paul's Rhetoric of Generosity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 137, no. 1 (2018):215-234. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.15699/jbl.1371.2018.292365.

Scullard, H. "Carthage and Rome." In *The Cambridge History of Ancient History Vol. VII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Seneca. *Natural Questions: Books I-III*. Translated by Thomas Corcoran. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Sider, Robert. *Christian and Pagan in The Roman Empire: The Witness of Tertullian*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University Press, 2001.

Stanton, Graham N., Bruce W. Longenecker and Stephen C. Barton. *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2004.

Stead, Christopher. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

———. "Divine Substance in Tertullian." *The Journal of Theological Studies*. NEW SERIES. 14, no. 1 (1963): 46-66. January 15, 2019. www.jstor.org/stable/23954327.

Steward-Sykes, Alistiar. “Ordination Rites and Patronage Systems in Third-Century Africa.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 56, No. 2 (2002):115-130. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1584853.

Swete, Henry B. *The Holy Spirit in The Ancient Church: A Study of Christian Teaching in The Age of The Fathers*. London: Macmillan and Company, 1912.

———. “Penitential Discipline in The First Three Centuries.” *The Journal of Theological Studies* 4, no. 15 (1903): 321-37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23949738.

Tabbernee, William. *Montanist Inscriptions and Testimonia: Epigraphic Sources Illustrating The History of Montanism*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Thomas, Ivo. “The Holy Ghost.” *Life of the Spirit (1946-1964)*2, no. 19 (1948): 289-98. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43702948.

“The Martyrdom of Polycarp.” In *The Apostolic Fathers*. 3rd Edition. Edited by Michael Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

“The Passion of The Scillitan Martyrs.” In *Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol.* IX. Translation by A. Robinson. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 2012.

Tibbs, Clint. “Mediumistic Divine Possession among Early Christians: A Response to Craig S. Keener’s ‘Spirit Possession as a Cross-Cultural Experience.’” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* Vol. 26, No. 2 (2016): 173-194. Accessed March 15, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26371648.

Torjesen, Karen J. “Clergy and Laity.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter, 389-405. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Trevett, Christine. *Montanism: Gender, Authority, and The New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Van Der Nat, P. G. “Tertullianea.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 18, no. 3 (1964): 129-43. doi:10.2307/1582088.

Wasink, J. H. *The Treatise Against Hermogenes*. ACW. New York: Newman Press, 1956.

———. “Observations on Tertullian’s Treatise against Hermogenes.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 9, no. 2 (1955): 129-47. Accessed December 19, 2019. doi:10.2307/1582665.

Wedin, Michael. “The Structure and Substance of Substance.” In *Aristotle’s Theory of Substance: The Categories and Metaphysics Zeta*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Weinandy, Thomas. "Zizioulas: The Trinity and Ecumenism." *New Blackfriars* 83, no. 979 (2002): 407-15. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43250194.

Weinrich, William. *Spirit and Martyrdom: A Study of The Work of The Holy Spirit in Contexts of Persecution and Martyrdom in The New Testament and Early Christian Literature*.Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1981.

Wheatley, Alan. *Patronage in Early Christianity*. Eugene: Pickwick Publishing, 2011.

Wilhite, David E. *Ancient African Christianity: An Introduction to a Unique Context and Tradition*. London: Routledge Publishing, 2017.

Williams, Ritva. *Stewards, Prophets, Keepers of The Word: Leadership in The Early Church*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2006.

Wypustek, Andrzej. "Magic, Montanism, Perpetua, and the Severan Persecution." *Vigiliae Christianae* 51, no. 3 (1997): 276-97. doi:10.2307/1584216.